The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XV (N. S. IX) JANUARY, 1930 No. 4

EARLIEST SETTLEMENTS OF THE ILLINOIS COUNTRY.*

This paper purposes to set forth, as far as may be done in so brief a space, the findings of recent research in regard to the origins of the earliest settlements of the Illinois Country. The varying territorial implications suggested by the name Illinois Country are too numerous to discuss here. However, the term had in French official usage of the colonial period a fairly fixed denotation, being applied in the main to a relatively narrow strip or ribbon of land running across the entire valley of the Mississippi from the Alleghanies to the Rockies with limits on the north and south set roughly by the latitudes of the lower end of Lake Michigan and the mouth of the Ohio. St. Louis thus found itself within the bounds of the Illinois Country and its official designation was almost invariably " St. Louis of the Illinois ".

Of the settlements made in the Illinois Country during the French regime I purpose speaking of three in particular: Cahokia, Kaskaskia, and Vincennes. To these I make bold to add Chicago, for although it is not likely that there ever was a settlement of whites in the proper sense of the term, at least a continuous one, at or near the mouth of the Chicago River before the opening years of the nineteenth century, still Chicago had a " local habitation

*A paper read at the Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Vincennes, Indiana, April 25-27, 1929.

and a name" in cartography, in the literature of travel, in correspondence, official and private, before any of the settlements I have named came into being. Anyone who works among the surviving records of that remote period must be impressed with the casualness with which Chicago, in a form orthographically almost identical with the current spelling of the name, is referred to as a perfectly well known and familiar place. Needless to say it was the portage or carrying place between the two great river-systems of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi which gave the locality of Chicago its prominence from the earliest days, the mile and a half of dry land that normally formed the actual Continental Divide being at a point within the limits of the present city.

What is apparently the earliest mention of the name of the future metropolis in extant documentary sources is in LaSalle's letter of September 2, 1683, written from "Chicagoumeman".[1] Under the same form the name of the city appeared in Franquelin's map of 1684, while on the same cartographer's map of 1688 we have "Fort Chicagou".[2] Two topics bearing on seventeenth-century Chicago especially challenge attention, the precise location of the "Mission of the Guardian Angel of Chicago", the name it goes by in a contemporary document, and the alleged existence of a French fort on the terrain of the future metropolis. These topics have been carefully dealt with by Dr. Quaife in his *Chicago and the Old Northwest, 1673-1835,* published in 1914, and I would not say that subsequent research has added anything substantial to his discussion of the same.[3] I would only point out with regard to the mission-site that the Chicago Historical Society appears to have taken a stand in the matter by exhibiting in its rooms a chart which indicates the mission as located on the north

[1] The original of this letter is in the keeping of the Chicago Historical Society.

[2] Franquelin's map of 1684 is reproduced in Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations,* LIX. The 1688 map of the same cartographer is in Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest.*

[3] Milo M. Quaife, *Chicago and the Old Northwest, 1673-1835* (Chicago, 1914), 39-42. *Cf.* also Garraghan, *The Catholic Church in Chicago, 1673-1871* (Chicago, 1921), 13-20.

branch of the Chicago River in the district known as Bowmanville, well within the limits of the municipality. The evidence pointing to this recently conjectured location is chiefly archeological, the most extensive Indian village site in the Chicago area being found in this vicinity, with Indian trails crossing it in various directions.[4] Moreover, a French oven and a metal crucifix of antique make have been found on or near the supposed Bowmanville mission-site. To what extent this location conflicts with the only documentary description of the mission that is extant, namely the few lines found in the Abbé St. Cosme's letter of January 2, 1699, I cannot here undertake to say, for it would require more space than is available; but a close reading of the St. Cosme letter will, I think, make it clear that the Mission of the Guardian Angel, Chicago's earliest center of organized life, must still be placed where Dr. Quaife placed it in 1914, namely somewhere along the half a mile or so of river bank between Lake Michigan and the forks of the Chicago River.[5]

As to the query whether a French fort ever existed at Chicago, I may say here that I undertook on this and cognate topics bearing on seventeenth-century Chicago some little research in the summer of 1925 in the Colonial Archives in Paris. The outcome was disappointing though more protracted investigation might have issued in better results. As it was, almost the only reference to a French fort in Chicago that I was able to bring to light was a passage from a joint report of October 19, 1697, of Frontenac and the Intendant Champigny to the Minister in Paris: "The Sieur DeLiette, a petty officer of the troops and a cousin of the Sieur De Tonti commands at the post of Chicagou, country of the Miami."[6] The same report makes complaint that De Tonti and his partner, De la Forest, have disobeyed the king's order forbidding them to carry on trade: "It is well to inform you, Monseigneur, that just now they have a magazine at Chicagou in the Miami country and

[4] Albert F. Scharf, *Indian Trails and Villages of Chicago and of Cook, Du Page and Will Counties, Ill. (1804) as shown by weapons and implements of the Stone Age.* Chicago, 1900.

[5] The St. Cosme letter is in Kellogg, *op. cit.*, 346.

[6] Archives Coloniales, C" A, 15, f. 81.

another at Missilimakinac." As to De Liette, the Newberry Library in Chicago has an unpublished memoir from his pen in which he records that he resided at Chicago for four years, this period, as far as the internal evidence of the document indicates, being apparently the years 1698-1702. A document in Margry mentions the Sieur De Mantet as a former commandant at Chicago, while Cadillac in a list of western posts of date about 1700 includes "Post Chicagou."[7] Finally Franquelin's map of 1688, as we have seen, indicates Fort Chicagou, while Louvigny's map of approximate date 1697 marks the Chicago locality with the legend *Poste des François et Ouatenons (Wea)*.[8] From these dates the inference would seem to be at least probable if not quite certain, that there was some sort of military post at Chicago in the last decade of the seventeenth century though it was evidently on a very modest scale and must have been abandoned almost immediately after the turn of the century named.

No survey of recent research in the field of seventeenth-century Chicago history would be complete without mention of the notable work on the old Chicago Portage Route brought out in 1928 by Robert H. Knight and Lucius W. Zeuch. Here we have a thoroughgoing and comprehensively scientific study of a problem which has long vexed the students of exploring and missionary enterprise in the upper Illinois Country. The data accumulated by the authors, one an engineer and the other a physician, are the fruits of wide documentary research and of years of personal first-hand investigation of the terrain in question. One feels little hesitation in accepting as historically correct the path they have traced for Jolliet and Marquette as they made the first passage of record across the site of the world's fourth largest center of population.[9]

[7] Margry, *Découvertes et établissements des Français*, 5: 123. However, it is probably significant that Cadillac speaks only of a "post" at Chicago while in the same document he calls the establishment on the St. Joseph River a "fort" with a "French garrison."

[8] A copy of the Louvigny map is in the Ayer Collection, Newberry Library, Chicago.

[9] Robert W. Knight, M. W. S. E., and Lucius H. Zeuch, M. D., *The Location of the Chicago Portage Route of the Seventeenth-Century*. A paper read before

From Chicago we hasten to Cahokia, the second earliest of the settlements or quasi-settlements of the Illinois Country. I have not been able to trace, at least in any printed source in the vernacular, any statement of the correct date of the foundation of Cahokia earlier than 1909. In that year appeared in the *Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society* a paper by Edward Joseph Fortier of the University of Illinois dealing with the Tamaroa Mission, out of which the settlement known as Cahokia subsequently grew. The writer was able to show by unpublished correspondence obtained from Laval University in Quebec that the first residence of white men on the site of Cahokia began with the laying out thereon of the Mission of the Holy Family in March, 1699. Since that time the settlement has had a continuous existence down to our own day. Here then was a date of some importance accurately and definitely fixed through the evidence of an unpublished letter which had not previously been brought to bear upon the problem. The correspondence which Mr. Fortier thus happily used to elucidate the origins of historic Cahokia both as to the date of its birth and the circumstances which brought it forth was that of the Abbé Jean Bergier, resident pastor of Cahokia during the period 1701-1708. This correspondence, practically all of it still unpublished, is in the archives of Laval University and despite the two centuries that have elapsed since its production is still in an excellent state of preservation.[10]

Almost directly across from Cahokia on the west bank of the Mississippi and at the mouth of the River Des Pères, the Fathers' River, was a Jesuit mission-post, which rounded out its brief career in two years and a half, from the fall of 1700 to the spring of 1703. That there had one time been a mission in the locality indicated was long a matter of tradition, which the name of the diminutive river seemed to bear out; but there was until recently

the Chicago Historical Society and later elaborated for publication. Chicago Historical Society, 1928, xvi + 145.

[10] The writer of this paper has utilized the Bergier correspondence in two studies of recent date, "The Emergence of the Missouri Valley into History," *Thought*, I (1926), 193-212, and "New Light on Old Cahokia," *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, XI (1928), 99-146.

absolutely no direct or documentary evidence pointing to its existence. Houck's *History of Missouri,* a scholarly work practically exhausting all available sources of information and appearing as late as 1908, could say no more than that there was a persistent but unverified tradition that a mission existed at one time on the banks of the Des Pères. How the tradition was finally substantiated and the existence of the village proved to a demonstration makes an interesting story. In the Fortier article of 1909 on the beginnings of Cahokia was embodied an extract from a letter of the Abbé Bergier of date April 13, 1701, which informed his correspondent in Canada that the Katz or Kaskaskia Indians had settled on the opposite or western bank of the Mississippi two leagues below Cahokia. This may have been a news item of contemporaneous interest but it had apparently no particular significance for Mr. Fortier, who gave it publicity for the first time in his article. However just fifteen years later Rev. Laurence Kenny, S. J., of St. Louis University, meeting in Fortier's article the allusion to the Katz or Kaskaskia Indians and their new settlement on the west bank of the Mississippi two leagues below Cahokia, at once divined its significance as furnishing a key to the solution of the mystery of the village on the Des Pères. Here was a contemporary written record vouching for the presence, in a locality corresponding to that of the Des Pères, of Indian and French settlers with missionaries to serve their religious needs. With the aid of supplementary data supplied by maps and other more or less contemporary sources, Father Kenny was able to build up a conclusive argument establishing the one time reality of an eighteenth-century mission and village at the mouth of the Des Pères, his findings being embodied in a paper which he contributed to the April, 1920, issue of the *St. Louis Catholic Historical Review.* Since that time additional light has been thrown on the history of this settlement, Missouri's earliest center of civilized life, by fresh research in the Bergier correspondence in Quebec.[11] Moreover, the site of this mission-post and village, indicated on a

[11] Garraghan, "The First Settlement on the Site of St. Louis," *Illinois Catholic Historical Review,* IX (1927), 342-347.

De Lisle map of 1703, is likewise indicated, but with more precision on an unpublished map of 1732 found in the Karpinski collection of cartographical photostats recently brought to the United States.[12] The existence of this settlement on a terrain lying at the southern present municipal limits of St. Louis is therefore established with a finality as complete as that which obtains for any known historical fact. As a sequel to this solution of a long standing historical problem, the Society of the First Families of Virginia is preparing with the concurrence of the municipal authorities of St. Louis to mark the site of the Des Pères settlement of 1701-1703 with a suitable memorial.

Our next hurried glance is at Kaskaskia, one-time metropolis of the Illinois Country. Here we face a matter concerning which much confusion has prevailed and even in a measure still prevails in printed accounts, but which it will be possible, I think, to clear up within a reasonable margin of certainty. What is the date of foundation of Kaskaskia? Dr. Clarence W. Alvord in a paper of 1907, as also in his *Illinois Country* appearing in 1918, gives the date 1700, which we shall presently see is not correct. In accepting this date Alvord went on the assumption that the Kaskaskia Indians on leaving their village on the Illinois River, a fact not questioned by anybody as it rests on explicit contemporary evidence, moved directly down to their future home on the Kaskaskia in Randolph County, Illinois. In other words, Alvord leaves entirely out of account the stay of two years and a half made, as we have seen, by the Kaskaskia Indians at the mouth of the Des Pères River. This temporary resting-place of the tribe admits of no doubt as we have pointed out. However, the evidence for it had not all been given publicity at the time Alvord brought out his *Illinois Country,* (1918), though it became known to him later. Then, for some or other reason he seemed to be sceptical regarding the conclusions it led to. However, this is of no great import. The detail furnished by the Bergier correspondence is so abundant as regards the movements of missionaries and Indians between

[12] Garraghan, "Some Newly Discovered Missouri Maps," *Missouri Historical Society Collection,* V (June, 1928), 256-264.

Cahokia and the Des Pères settlement that the existence of the latter cannot in any manner be called into question. How long did this settlement continue? The question is answered in the Bergier letters. The Kaskaskia Indians arrived at the Des Pères in the fall or early winter of 1700 and were there under the spiritual charge of Père Gabriel Marest. "Pere Maretz [*Marest*]", writes the Abbé Bergier from Cahokia, April 16, 1703, "is going twenty-five leagues further down with his village about a days journey from the Ouabache [*Ohio*], where M. Juchereau has made a big establishment."[13] Somewhat later, July 3 of the same year, the Abbé Bergier again writes from Cahokia: "All the French who were here, afraid of being killed or plundered [*by the Sioux*] are abandoning the village and are going some to Pere Maretz's [*Marest's*] mission 25 leagues lower down the River of the Metchagamias, others to the Ouabache [*Ohio*] with a view to safety."[14] Supplementing this statement we have the following entry in the Register of the Kaskaskia Mission now preserved at St. Louis University, the orginal entry being in Latin: "1703, April 25 We came to the banks of the river called the Metchagamia".[15] The river of the Metchagamias or the Metchagamna appears to be none other than the Kaskaskia or Okaw River of later days.[16] Here then we have contemporary documentary evidence establishing the

[13] Laval University Archives, Quebec. The originals of the Bergier letters are of course in French.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] "*Extrait des Registres des Baptêmes de la Mission des Illinois Sous le titre de l'Immaculée Conception de la S. V*". "1703 Apr. 25, Ad ripam Metchagamiam dictam venimus".

[16] The writer after diligent search, especially in the Margry and Karpinski cartographical collections in the Newberry Library, Chicago, has been unable to find the Metchigamia or the River of the Metchigamias indicated anywhere for the Kaskaskia River. On the other hand, more than one early map (e. g., *Carte de l'Amérique du Nord*, c. 1690, Karpinski photostat) gives the name "Matsigamea" to what is apparently the Sangamon, an affluent of the Illinois. However, the precise data afforded by the Bergier letters cannot be adjusted to the location of the Sangamon. *Cf.* also Moses, *Illinois Historical and Statistical*, 99, *note*, D'Artaguiette's Journal in Mereness, *Travels in the American Colonies*, and *American State Papers*, Public Lands, II, p. 174, for data helping to locate the Metchagamia. *Cf.* also Penicault's *Relation*, which describes the river along which the Kaskaskia settled as a tributary of the Mississippi.

fact that the Kaskaskia Indians with their Jesuit pastor had settled in the Spring of 1703 about twenty leagues below Cahokia on the banks of a river which can be no other than the Kaskaskia, a locality corresponding nearly if not altogether so to the locality of historic Kaskaskia. The two passages from the Abbé Bergier's correspondence and the entry in the mission register sum up all the contemporary evidence available for determining the precise date at which Kaskaskia began to be. The next earliest document to carry mention of Kaskaskia is, apart from Penicault's *Relation,* a letter in the *Jesuit Relations* dated from there in 1706, but furnishing absolutely no information as to how the settlement came to be formed.[17]. I know the question may be raised as to whether or not the mission-site of 1703 was quite identical with the Kaskaskia village-site of later years. There is no evidence at hand to solve the problem; but it is not of any particular moment in our inquiry. The mission-site of 1703 and historic Kaskaskia were both on the banks of the same river, the Metchagamias or Kaskaskia, and they could not have been far apart, so that the historical continuity of the two settlements could easily have been preserved. I see no difficulty, therefore, in accepting the year 1703 for the date of foundation of Kaskaskia, around which Mississippi Valley history was to turn for many a decade, and which retained its importance in political and social life in the Illinois Country even after Illinois had grown to statehood. I conclude this topic by adverting to the interesting circumstance that the only decisive evidence we possess today for determining the dates of origin of Cahokia, the Des Pères Village, and Kaskaskia, which if we leave Chicago out of account, rank first, second and third in the series of earliest settlements in the Illinois Country, is to be found in the correspondence of the same group of missionary clergymen, the Priests of the Foreign Missions, whose correspondence, practically all of it still unpublished, rests today in the archives of Laval University, Quebec.

And now we come at last to old Vincennes. The French settlement out of which was evolved Indiana's most historic town lay

[17] Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations,* LXVI, 51-65.

within the bounds of the Illinois Country and so we may take the question of its date of origin to come within the purview of the present paper. This date was long a matter of speculation, not to say of guess work, among Indiana historians, and in the absence of adequate documentary evidence along with the misinterpretation of such meager sources of information as did exist until recent date, it is not surprising that conclusions were reached which went considerably wide of the mark. Judge Law, probably the first serious student of the problem, confused the actual French fort on the Wabash with another French fort, the one established by Juchereau in 1702 at the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi.[18] Early geographical nomenclature gave the name Ouabache to the Ohio below its confluence with the Wabash River of today. So it was that data in a contemporary Jesuit letter referring to Juchereau's fort at the mouth of the Ohio were unwittingly referred by Judge Law to the fort and settlement of Vincennes with the result that the beginnings of the latter were set back by him to a date as early as 1710 or 1711.[19] But an origin even more remote was found for this venerable outpost of French advance in the valley of the Mississippi. In Goodrich and Tuttle's *History of Indiana* published at least fifty years ago we read that in 1702, a Jesuit missionary from Canada, unknown by name, conducted services on the site of Vincennes with an astonished group of Indians looking on.[20] As authority for this important statement the authors refer vaguely in a foot-note to " Quebec Annals ", without indicating in any manner the nature of this source of information. It being impossible to verify or evaluate in any way the statement found in Goodrich and Tuttle, the critical investigator must be excused from attaching any particular weight to it. And yet this date 1702 for the foundation of Vincennes, whether as a

[18] For pertinent extracts from Law's paper *cf.* Alerding, *History of the Catholic Church in Vincennes*, Indianapolis, 1883.

[19] Law (cited in Alerding, *op. cit.*, 50) used a misleading translation of Father Gabriel Marest's letter of Nov. 9, 1712 (Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, LXVI, 237), which led him to place Father Mermet at Vincennes in 1712 though the letter itself says explicitly that Mermet was then residing at Kaskaskia.

[20] Cited in Alerding, *op. cit.*, 34.

military post or as a settlement of whites, obtained a wide vogue, and though careful research has since clearly established that it is earlier by thirty years than the actual date, it still continues to find a place in several of our reputed standard and up-to-date works of reference. Thus 1702 is given as the date of foundation of Vincennes in the *Encyclopedia Americana* (1925), the *International Encyclopedia* (1924), the *Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia* (1913), and *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History* (1909).

Everybody knows that the tendency of the modern scientific school of history is to discount oral tradition and at least when possible to base conclusions on documentary evidence alone. "No history without documents" is the watchword of the modern thoroughgoing devotee of Clio. And yet oral tradition sometimes points the way to the goal while the uncritical use of documents has not infrequently led the researcher astray. When Volney the traveler came to Vincennes in 1796 he gathered, apparently on the witness of the oldest inhabitants, that their village came into being about 1735, a date which came within the true date of the establishment of Post Vincennes by a margin of two or three years. Still, with this traditional date before him, for he refers to Volney's statement, Judge Law, using what he thought was documentary evidence, went some twenty years off the track when he attempted to fix the initial year of Vincennes' career. I take it that the incident has significance for historical workers pointing as it does to the caution one must employ in setting entirely aside data which have no other support than what we are sometimes moved to call the precarious one of oral tradition.

In recent or relatively recent critical investigation into the historical beginnings of Vincennes three first-hand studies are outstanding. The first of these was J. P. Dunne's paper, "The Mission to the Oubache", in the *Indiana Historical Society Publications* for 1902, a paper integrated largely of previously unpublished material from the French archives. In 1916, followed in the same *Publications* the paper, "Sieur de Vincennes Identified", by the scholarly provincial archivist of Quebec, Pierre-Georges Roy. This searching study based on intimate examination

of a large body of newly found manuscript material placed beyond cavil the identity of the person to whom Vincennes is indebted for its origin. This was François Bissot, Sieur de Vincennes, an officer in the French service at the same time as his father, Jean Baptiste Bissot. Finally, in 1920 appeared in the *Indiana Magazine of History* Professor Paul Phillips's "Vincennes and French Colonial Policy", by far the most satisfying study as far as I am aware that has so far been made of the circumstances that led up to the establishment of Post Vincennes. Phillips appears to have been the first to bring to bear upon the problem the splendid body of pertinent source-material from the French archives now available to students on this side of the water in transcripts in the Library of Congress and elsewhere. As to the date of the establishment by Sieur de Vincennes of the military post which later bore his name, it is assigned in this latest and most decisive inquiry into the subject to late in 1732 or early in 1733.[21] Moreover, no evidence of any kind was found of the presence of any missionaries in the Vincennes region earlier than 1734 when the Jesuit Alexis Xavier Guyenne was reported by Bienville, Governor of Louisiana, as being on a visit to the new post on the Wabash. Professor Phillips met with no trace of the existence of the fort previous to the period indicated above. That it was in full operation later than that period there is abundant and incontestible evidence. Just when the French settlement was first organized around the fort as a nucleus may still be matter of conjecture. It came at all events later than the fort, and the establishment of the latter, in all probability during the period 1732-1733, may be taken to mark definitely the historical starting-point of Vincennes.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN.

[21] "It appears that Vincennes lived among the Miamis for at least four years before building his post. It could not have been before late in 1732 or early in 1733 that the foundations for the new establishment were laid" (Phillips, *l. c.*). The writer has seen an unpublished paper by the late Mr. Ben Sager of Vincennes, a thoroughgoing student of Vincennes beginnings, in which the claim is made that the historic town began its career in 1729. A plausible but by no means conclusive bit of contemporary documentary evidence cited by Pierre-Georges Roy (*Le Sieur de Vincennes, Fondateur de L'Indiana et sa Famille.* Quebec, 1919) is advanced in support of the claim.

WHAT IS MEANT BY CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

Elizabethan and Cromwellian Persecutions

During the last fortnight in June and the first fortnight in July of the past year (1929), Ireland experienced such tremors of religious fervor as even the oldest inhabitants cannot remember to have been surpassed or equalled. The occasion was the celebrations in honor of the Centenary of Catholic Emancipation. When educated members of the present generation in Ireland are found guilelessly asking what was Catholic Emancipation and what did Daniel O'Connell accomplish, it may be presumed that some of the Irish race in America also are asking similar questions. The following pages are an answer to those questions, brief no doubt, but sufficiently full for the purpose.

A living English statesman has stated that the story of Ireland's struggle for freedom is the greatest epic in the world's history. He refers, of course, to the political struggle. But the fight for religious freedom, although of shorter duration—a mere matter of three hundred years—is the greatest of all epics. It was more universal, more intense, and was raging when all thought of political freedom had vanished from Irish minds. It involved not only the existence of the Catholic faith in Ireland but the very existence of the native Irish population, not excluding those Anglo-Norman Catholics who suffered and fought equally with the mere Irish.

Catholic Emancipation is generally taken to mean the removal of the last of the shackles that bound the Irish people in the profession of the Catholic faith. The beginning of this slavery is generally dated from the diabolical conception of penal laws which took place after the breaking of the Treaty of Limerick of October 3, 1691. In reality that is only part of the story. The stage and all its trappings had been prepared more than a hundred years previously. The shackling of the Church of St. Patrick had its

inception in the lust of power and money which burned with other lusts in the restless heart of Henry VIII of England.

The colonial parliament in Dublin in 1536 yielded to his aggression, and Henry found willing, but mercenary agents, to suppress the Irish religious houses, to hand over the possessions to the Treasury, and to provide himself with precious jewels and ornaments for the adornment of his wives.[1] Drastic and disastrous though all this was, yet it was his illegitimate daughter Elizabeth who gave what she thought would be the *coup de grace* to the Irish Church, by her Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity in 1559, supported by oaths, involving schism and heresy, to be taken by all holding temporal or spiritual offices. Even though fines and penalties were imposed for non-attendance at Protestant worship no change of heart was effected in the Irish people. And when, to escape the penalties, they put in an appearance at Protestant service, they treated it as a "May-game". Indeed, the State Papers of the period are a continuous lamentation of the "ungodly" Irish who preferred imprisonment and loss of possessions to the loss of their faith.

Forbidden the public celebration of Mass, Catholics had to stand by and see their ancient churches falling into decay, the very walls of which to this day protest against the fiction that Elizabeth founded a Church in Ireland. Nevertheless, she and her mercenary "farmers" put into their pockets the tithes, originally intended for the support of the churches, and that of the Irish priests. This continued spoliation of Irish Catholics for the support of Elizabeth's clergy and their imported ritual was perhaps the most shameless and unpardonable instance of tyranny in the name of religion in European history. It brought about the Tithe War shortly after the Emancipation of 1829, cost a million Irish lives, and was terminated only by the endowment of the Protestant Church at its disestablishment in 1869 as the official English "Church of Ireland". But both because of the Bull of Pius V of 1570 and because of the failure of her "reform" the dogs of war were let loose after 1580, culminating in the

[1] Ronan, *The Reformation in Dublin (1536-1558)*. Dublin, 1926.

martyrdom of many ecclesiastics and laymen whose process of beatification is now before the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

With the accession of the son of Mary Queen of Scots to the English throne as James I, Irish hopes ran high only to be dashed to the ground. It was this unfortunate devotion of the people to the Stuart cause that brought about the disastrous dissension in 1641-45 between the native Irish and the Anglo-Irish Catholics. James, however, soon showed that the religion of his mother (if she was really his mother) found no sympathetic response in his heart, but that, on the contrary, he meant to pursue the policy of the murderess of his mother. On July 4, 1605, he commanded "all Jesuits, seminary priests, or other priests whatsoever, made and ordained by any authority derived or pretended to be derived from the See of Rome", to depart from the kingdom before the end of December. All priests who refused to obey or who ventured to come into Ireland after that date, and all who received or assisted such persons were to be arrested and punished according to the laws and statutes of that realm, and all the people were exhorted "to come to their several parish churches or chapels, to hear divine service every Sunday and holiday" under threat of being punished for disobedience.[2] The royal proclamation produced little or no effect in spite of the heavy fines imposed on wealthy citizens in the principal cities and towns who were selected with the object of terrorising the common people. Notwithstanding all proclamations, there were in 1613 in Ireland "about 800 secular priests, 130 Franciscans, 20 Jesuits, and a few Benedictines and Dominicans".[3]

During the opening years of the reign of Charles I (1625-1649) the persecution was much less violent, and as Charles was married to a French Catholic princess, and as he had promised solemnly not to enforce the laws against Catholics, it was hoped that at last they might expect toleration. But the very mention of toleration filled the Protestant bishops with alarm. Those prelates declared that

[2] *Cal. State Papers, Ireland* (James I), I, 301-3.

[3] MacCaffrey, *History of the Catholic Church from the Renaissance to the French Revolution*, II, 378. (London, 1915).

> The religion of the Papists is superstitious and idolatrous; their faith and doctrine erroneous and heretical, their church in respect of both apostatical. To give them, therefore, a toleration, or to consent that they may freely exercise their religion, and profess their faith and doctrine is a grievous sin, and that in two respects. For it is to make ourselves accessory, not only to their superstitions, idolatries, and heresies, and in a word, to all the abominations of Popery; but also which is a consequent of the former to the perdition of the seduced people which perish in the deluge of Catholic apostacy. To grant them toleration, in respect of any money to be given or contribution to be made by them, is to set religion to sale, and, with it, the souls of the people whom Christ Our Saviour hath redeemed with His Most precious blood.[4]

Following this proclamation the churches that had been opened for Catholic worship in the various cities and towns were attacked, the altars destroyed, and the priests seized. No toleration was to be given to Catholics lest the projected plantation of Ireland by Protestants should be upset. The Confederate War, 1641-45, supported by the papal representative Rinuccini and the celebrated Irish Franciscan, Luke Wadding, was brought to an untimely end by the dissensions between Anglo-Irish and native Irish. The root of the dissensions, as we have already stated, was the senseless devotion to the Stuart cause on the part of the Anglo-Irish Catholics, which gained such a footing among some of the natives that even the renowned Four Masters in their *Annals* of Ireland were not immune from the contagion.

In August, 1649, Oliver Cromwell arrived in Dublin with a large force to crush both Royalists and Catholics. Those 17,000 soldiers, the very flower of the Puritan army, fierce and fanatical, were inflamed to satanic hatred against the Irish race and the Catholic religion. "Cursed be he", wrote one of their preachers, "who holdeth back the sword from blood; Yea! cursed be he that maketh not the sword stark drunk with Irish blood. . . . . Let not that eye look for pity nor hand be spared, that pities or spares them; and let him be cursed that curseth them not bitterly." Such were the sentiments that inspired this band of pseudo-

[4] Ussher's *Works*, I, 72.

crusaders who came to exterminate the most Christian people in Europe.

The wholesale massacres of Drogheda and Wexford and the trek of the people of Leinster, Munster, and Ulster across the Shannon to Connacht followed, filling one of the most cruel pages in Irish history. The restoration of Charles II did not, however, bring about the expected toleration of the Catholic religion. On the accession of James II in 1685, the Catholics of Ireland had reason to hope for an improvement of their position, and this time at least they were not disappointed, though the improvement was short-lived. The battles of the Boyne, Aughrim, and Limerick were the scenes of the pivotal engagements of a campaign in which the armies of James and William of Orange battled for a kingdom, and the Irish people fought for political and religious liberty. The famous Treaty of Limerick was signed on October 3, 1691, and its terms were confirmed by William. The first of its articles was an unconditional guarantee of religious freedom to the Irish people.

Honour was not, however, to be found among the Irish Protestant bishops, who took care to inflame passion and bigotry by declaring that no faith should be kept with "heretics", and when Parliament met in 1692 it was in no mood to make any concessions. The few Catholic members who presented themselves were called upon to subscribe a Declaration against Transubstantiation drawn up by the English Parliament in 1691. Having in this way excluded all Catholics from Parliament, an exclusion that lasted until the Emancipation Act of 1829, the Houses refused absolutely to confirm the Treaty of Limerick. The sequel was a century of persecution, a century of penal laws due solely to the desire of the Protestant minority to wreak a terrible vengeance on their Catholic countrymen; to drive them out of public life, by excluding them from the learned professions and from all civil and military offices, to deprive them of the means of education at home and abroad, to uproot religion by banishing the bishops and clergy, and in a word, to reduce them to the same position as the native population of the English plantations in the West Indies.

The Penal Code

From the Treaty of Limerick a new period of Irish history begins—that of the penal laws. In the former period there was open and bloody persecution, the aim of the penal legislation being the complete suppression of Catholic worship. The eighteenth century, however, witnessed a change of ideas. It was no longer fashionable to put the Irish to death for their faith, and the attempt to secure uniformity of worship and the acknowledgment of the Supremacy in religious matters was abandoned. But an ingenious series of laws, to which popular opinion has attached *par excellence* the name *Penal Laws,* was devised to impoverish and weaken in every way those "Dissenters" in particular who acknowledged the authority of Rome. It was the same spirit of Protestant intolerance, but with a new mode of manifestation.

The great Edmund Burke, writing of the penal code to Sir Hercules Langrishe, one of the more generous-minded Protestant landlords who composed the Irish Parliament in Dublin, says:

> You abhorred it, as I did, for its vicious perfection. For I must do it justice; it was a complete system full of coherence and consistency; well digested and well composed in all parts. It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance; and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man.[5]

The new regime, recognizing that the Irishman would not be turned into an Englishman, aimed at his impoverishment. Land, political power, riches were to be the monopoly of the Protestant. The Catholic might keep his religion; but, if he did, he was to be reduced to a hewer of wood and a drawer of water. The penal code was aimed at the Catholic body as a whole, at the landowners, and at the clergy.

By the Acts of the Irish Parliament under William, foreign education was forbidden; and no Papist was to teach school publicly or in private houses, except to the children of the family.

[5] *Cf.* Denis Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation,* 1.

Subsequent Acts reaffirmed and strengthened this, widening its scope, and increasing the penalties on popish schoolmasters. Papists were disarmed and forbidden to keep a horse above the value of five pounds.

Then came *An Act to Prevent Protestants Intermarrying with Papists,* imposing severe penalties on any such Protestant, and on the clergy celebrating such a marriage. In the same year, 1697, came an *Act to Prevent Papists being Solicitors.* This was amended and strengthened by subsequent Acts.

The most far reaching Act of the penal code, 2 Anne, c. vi, contained the following clauses: Persons perverting Protestants, and Protestants so perverted, are to be held guilty of *praemunire*; no Papist is to act as a guardian; all office holders are to take the Declaration against Transubstantiation, and to receive the Sacrament according to the rites of the Established Church. This excluded not only Catholics but all other Dissenters from office. No Papist is to vote for members of Parliament unless he takes the Oaths of Allegiance and of Abjuration of the Pretender.

The Act of 1709, explaining and amending the above Act, forbade any Papist in trade to have more than two apprentices, except in the hempen or flaxen manufacture.

The most important clauses of the *Act to Prevent the Further Growth of Popery* passed in 1703 were those directed against Catholic landowners. After the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, Catholics held at the outside one-seventh of twenty million English acres that Ireland contains. The confiscation that followed upon the Revolution of 1688 reduced the area held by Catholics to about one million acres. The new code was intended to effect that this area should never be increased, and should be as much as possible diminished.

The clauses may be briefly summarized as follows: If a child of a Catholic becomes a Protestant, an order for its maintenance is to be made by the Court of Chancery.

If the eldest son conforms, the Catholic parent becomes only tenant for life of all real estate held in fee-tail or fee-simple.

All Catholics are disabled from purchasing land, or from ac-

quiring it for a term of years longer than thirty-one years, and then at a rent equal to two-thirds of the annual value.

No Catholic is to take or have the profits by descent of land held by Protestants to whom he is the nearest relative. Catholics could, however, succeed to land held by Catholics but with certain limitations. These laid down that all lands held by a Catholic are to be of the nature of gavelkind. The owner could not dispose of them by will or make any settlement of them. At his death they must be divided equally among all the sons, and, failing sons, among all the daughters. The eldest son of a Catholic landowner, being a Protestant, or conforming within a year after his father's death, should inherit the whole property. As a result of this legislation, according to Lecky,[6] 4,055 persons were registered as converts between 1702 and 1773, of whom 2,117 conformed after 1752. Thirty-six landowners conformed between 1703 and 1709 and 150 within the next ten years.

The difficulty now arises: how did certain Catholic peers and others preserve their estates undivided? Here perhaps the kind-hearted " Protestant trustee " of popular belief may have come in. He certainly " came in " in many cases where Catholics desired to evade the laws forbidding them to purchase land, or lease it for more than thirty-one years, or to inherit from Protestants.

Though Catholic worship was no longer in itself illegal, the new code attempted to suppress it by the gradual extinction of the existing Catholic priesthood. So, in 1697, all Papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction and all regulars were banished. During the early months of 1698 over 460 of the clergy, mostly regulars, were shipped overseas under this Act. It was calculated that by the destruction of the hierarchy further ordinations in Ireland would be stopped.

But this did not prevent priests from abroad from coming into Ireland. In 1703, therefore, an Act forbade any popish priest to come into the kingdom, under penalty of being deemed a popish regular, and so liable to imprisonment and transportation on the first conviction, and to death for high treason on the second.

[6] Lecky, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, I, 292.

In 1708 there were only two bishops left, those of Dromore and Cashel, one in prison, the other too old to perform any ecclesiastical functions. Then followed two Acts for *Registering the Popish Clergy*. Priests so registered might officiate, but might not keep a curate, or officiate outside the parish for which they were registered. Breaches of these Acts led to the offender's being adjudged to be a popish regular. In accordance with the Act of 1703, 1089 secular priests registered themselves. But a further test was imposed in 1709. All registered priests were to take the Oath of Abjuration. This Oath, disclaiming any right to the Crown on the part of the Pretender, was obnoxious to many Protestants who were not prepared to deny on oath the title of the Stuart line. Fewer than forty priests took the Oath. Hence, from 1709 on, the secular clergy of Ireland were outlaws, liable to the penalties laid down for popish regulars by the Act of 1697—that is, to death on a second conviction. The very severity of these laws appears to have hindered their working, in spite of the zeal of the House of Commons and of many magistrates. The savage proposals of the Irish Commons in 1719 and 1723 sufficiently show the spirit that animated them.[7] Catholic chapels were closed in 1715 and in 1744-45. But after the latter date the persecuting spirit relaxed. After 1745 no further hindrances appear to have been put on Catholic worship; and by 1764 "Mass-houses" were being erected even in Ulster.

Intermarriage between Catholics and Protestants was frowned on by the law, and a series of Acts, each more drastic than its predecessor, dealt with priests who ventured to celebrate such marriages. In 1725 priests celebrating a marriage between two Protestants, or a Protestant and a Papist, were to be hanged as felons. A Father Timothy Ryan was hanged in 1726 under this Act. In 1745 all such marriages were made null and void but the priest so celebrating was still to be hanged as a felon, as was explained by an Act passed in 1749. This was the last enactment of the penal code.[8]

[7] Rev. W. Burke, *Irish Priests in the Penal Times*. Waterford, 1914.

[8] W. F. Butler, "What Catholic Emancipation Meant" (*Dublin Review*, April, 1929, 198-203).

These measures were not measures of self-defence, but the fruit of intense hatred of all that was Catholic and Irish, religious bigotry and racial hatred being the main sources.[9] The legislators, whether in Ireland or England, made no secret of their purpose: the extirpation of Irish Catholics, by beggaring the people and by destroying the supply of priests.

Catholic Associations

Towards the middle of the 18th century events were occurring at home and abroad which had a marked effect in lessening the rigours of the Penal Laws in Ireland. The very cruelty of their administration brought about a reaction against them, and many fair-minded Protestants were filled with shame and humiliation. The result of the collapse of a floor in a Dublin Mass-house during Divine Services and of the death of the celebrant and some of the congregation was that, in March 1744, chapels were allowed to be opened in Dublin, and gradually a similar concession was extended to the whole country.

A new Viceroy, Lord Chesterfield, by his wisdom and humanity, and by discouraging bigotry, protected Catholic chapels and the worshippers who assembled there. About this time, however, arose three men who became the pioneers of the Emancipation movement, namely, Dr. Curry of Dublin, Charles O'Connor of Ballinagar, and Thomas Wyse of Waterford. In a humble printer at "The Angel and Bible" in Cook street, Dublin, they found an active and zealous agent and helper in their issuing of books and tracts dealing with the Catholic position and the removal of Irish wrongs. His courageous action was all the more praiseworthy considering that there was a provision of the Penal Laws declaring: "Whoever imports, *prints,* buys or sells any Popish books written in English, forfeits forty shillings for every book."

The coming of the Duke of Bedford, in 1756, as Lord Lieutenant, who professed liberal sentiments towards Catholics, was thought an opportune moment for the presentation of an address

[9] Rev. A. M. Crofts, O.P., *The Penal Laws* (Catholic Emancipation Addresses, Dublin, June 20, 1929. See *Irish Rosary*, July, 1929).

in their name. The address, prepared by O'Connor, had four hundred names appended to it. Although there was considerable difference of opinion as to the prudence of this action, the reply, regarded then as gracious, was a sufficient reward. It informed them "that as long as they conducted themselves with duty and affection they could not fail to receive his Majesty's protection."

Although Catholics were thus recognized by Government, and protection nominally at least assured to them, the judiciary refused to follow the lead of the executive. Two years afterwards (1759), Lord Chancellor Bowes judicially decided that "the laws did not presume that a Papist has existence in this country, nor could they breathe without the connivance of the Government." Legally, of course, he was quite correct. But this state of uncertainty was resented by Catholics.

The first Catholic Committee was formed in 1760, and was composed of the clergy, nobility, and representatives of the people. The masses and the classes could not agree as to the policy to be pursued, though all agreed in demanding a repeal of the Penal Laws. They could not even agree as to the terms of an address to be presented to the new monarch, George III. The General Committee drew up one form of address that bore the signature of 600 Catholics. The aristocracy, headed by Lord Trimleston, presented an address from their own body. The Committee broke up, and ten years passed before a new organization was formed.

The Second Catholic Committee, established in Dublin under the presidency of Lord Kenmare in 1773, was more zealous and active in promoting the advancement of Catholic interests. Petitions, drawn up and presented to the Government in 1774, 1777, and 1778, were favorably received. Perhaps the situation in America influenced the Government more than the Catholic petitions. Whatever may have been the cause, a Relief Bill was introduced into Parliament in 1778, and soon became law, by which some of the most unjust provisions of the Penal Laws were removed from the statute book.

At this time the Irish Parliament was but the shadow of a legislative body, "a mere utensil to be used at their convenience by Cabinet Ministers in London." A Protestant party in the Parlia-

ment arose which began to utter the words, " Country and Patriotism ". Even the Catholic slave in his bondage forgot his wrongs for a while, and, overlooking the bigotry of those leaders of Irish national thought, he aided his Protestant fellow-countrymen in the movement to obtain for Ireland legislative independence. He contributed generously to their funds; he even bought and brought the arms that, under the existing laws he could not bear, and gave them to the Protestant Volunteers, letting them so carry them, and, if necessary, to use them until Ireland be free.

The constitutional victory gained, namely, the independence of the Irish Parliament, in 1782, should have earned for Irish Catholics consideration and gratitude. With the exception of Henry Grattan, the Protestant leaders proved themselves not only intolerant in their religious bigotry but short-sighted in their political action. Protestant ascendancy was as uppermost in their minds as in the days of William, and Catholics were an inferior race. With the exception of a few small concessions granted in an Act of Parliament which bore the offensive title, *An Act for the Further Relief of His Majesty's Subjects professing the Popish Religion,* no substantial redress was granted by the so-called " Patriot Parliament."

The Catholic Committee was aroused from its state of suspended animation by new and courageous leaders. Though the penal code succeeded in grinding down the agricultural population, yet it did not succeed in preventing the growth of a large and influential body of Catholic merchants. From these arose the new leaders of the Catholic movement, John Keogh, Edward Byrne, John Sweetman and Thomas Braughall, with Richard McCormick as their efficient secretary. Having strengthened and extended the Catholic organization throughout the country, they called together in February, 1791, representatives from different parts of Ireland. Their appeal to the Irish Parliament, " a clubhouse of bigotry and intolerance ", for relief of their disabilities, met with no response. In London, Keogh, and his Committee received more sympathy and encouragement from the English ministers who assured them that they would aid them in the advancement of the Catholic claims.

Withal, the Catholic Committee was not a happy family. A matter of policy divided it as it did the Committee of thirty years previously. Again the aristocracy differed from the general body, but with the expulsion of Lord Kenmare democracy gained the upper hand, and John Keogh became the acknowledged leader. Henceforward greater activity was displayed, the counties and provincial towns were organized, and delegates were elected to represent them. At a Catholic Convention in the Tailors' Hall, Back Lane, Dublin, December 2, 1792, three hundred delegates assembled and resolved that a petition should be presented directly to the King, requesting that Catholics should be restored to the equal enjoyment of the blessings of the constitution. The delegates, travelling via Belfast, where they were enthusiastically received, were received by the King in London, January 2, 1793. Their mission bore immediate fruit, for when the Irish Parliament met, January 10, a clause was added to the King's speech which trusted that the situation of His Majesty's Catholic subjects would engage their serious attention. Thus, for the first time since Henry VIII's aggression, Catholics were called by an English sovereign by their true name.

The Relief Bill, passed in the Irish Parliament, April, 1793, removed many Catholic grievances, but although it allowed Catholics to record their votes for Protestant candidates at parliamentary elections, it excluded Catholics from Parliament. Thus, Irish Catholics continued to have no voice in framing the laws of the nation. It may be here remarked that a similar Relief Bill had been passed in England in 1791, but only after prolonged controversy.

The opponents of Emancipation in Ireland were as diligent as those in England in asserting that the real motive of Catholics was to accomplish a sort of emancipation that was inconsistent with the safety of the established authority, and that Catholicism was intrinsically hostile to civil freedom and to a Protestant hierarchy. To counteract the malign influence of these insidious reports, which were circulated and exaggerated with ceaseless industry, the Catholic Committee, March 17, 1792, drew up a Declaration of the Catholics of Ireland that the pope had no authority to dis-

pense Catholics from allegiance to their sovereign. The Relief Bill of 1793, as we have said, was the result of these declarations, but, at the same time, a Convention Act was passed which made any further popular gatherings, such as the "Black Lane Parliament", illegal. This Act remained in force until the Land League days of 1879.[10]

On this Relief Bill of 1793 Wolfe Tone remarked:

> By one comprehensive clause, all penalties, forfeitures, disabilities, and incapacities are removed; the property of the Catholic is completely discharged from restraints and limitations of the penal laws, and their liberty, in a great measure, restored by the restoration of elective franchise. The right of self-defence is established by the restoration of the privilege to carry arms, subject to a restraint, which does not seem unreasonable, as excluding none but the very lowest orders. The unjust and the unreasonable distinctions affecting Catholics, as to service on grand and petty juries, are done away; the army, navy, and all offices and places of trust are opened to them, subject to exceptions hereafter mentioned. Catholics may be masters of fellows of any college hereafter to be founded [*sic*], subject to two conditions, that such college be a member of the university, and that it be not founded exclusively for the education of Catholics. They may be members of any lay body corporate, except Trinity College, any law, statute, or by-law, of such corporation to the contrary, notwithstanding. They may obtain degrees in the University of Dublin.

Having secured the substance of all that they had demanded, and many of them being half-frightened by the unexpected concession of votes to the forty-shilling freeholders, the Catholic Committee decided that its object had been fulfilled, and that further agitation would be an act of disrespect and ingratitude. The general Committee was called together again, and decided to dissolve itself at once as a mark of its full satisfaction with what had been accomplished. The question of admitting Catholics to Parliament no longer seemed an urgent or important grievance, and the Committee passed a resolution urging the Catholics "to cooperate in all loyal and constitutional means" to secure parliamentary reform.

[10] V. Rev. P. Monahan, *Pre-Emancipation Associations* (Catholic Emancipation Addresses, Dublin, June 21, 1929. See *Irish Rosary*, July, 1929.)

With the passing of the Act of 1793 the battle of the Irish Catholics was virtually won. But the history of the next seven years was to present a completely paradoxical situation—in which the Catholics, who seemed to have had everything to gain by preserving a separate Irish Parliament, were gradually induced by false promises of Catholic emancipation to support Pitt's policy of suppressing the Irish Parliament. On the other hand, the Ascendancy in Dublin, whose sole chance of resisting the determined pressure of Pitt lay in conciliating the Catholic population, continued in their blind bigotry to resist every demand for further concessions. They lost no time in endeavoring to minimise the effect of the Relief Act by using all their existing privileges to keep Catholics out of the positions that they had become entitled to hold. "The same influence", writes Wolfe Tone, "of which Catholics complain, has been, ever since the passing of the Bill, exerted to prevent their reaping benefit even from the privileges of which by law they are now capable."

Two immediate results of the Bill of 1793 had a profound influence upon the years that came after it. For some time after the disbanding of the General Committee the Catholics ceased from all active agitation on their own behalf. On the other hand, the passing of the Act diminished still further the greatly weakened influence of the Catholic aristocracy. Their secession from the movement had left its direction entirely in the hands of John Keogh and his democratic friends, who received a new and unexpected prestige. At the same time, the remaining restrictions left by the Act had placed the Catholic gentry in a most humiliating position. They were still excluded from Parliament or from being sheriffs or sub-sheriffs, so that their political rights were now no greater than those of any Catholic forty-shilling freeholder in the country.

We are not concerned here with the agitation of the United Irishman or with the disastrous rising of 1798. William Pitt, the Prime Minister of George III, had already made up his mind to pass an Act of Union between England and Ireland, and thus terminate the Dublin Parliament. Towards this end he promised Catholic emancipation, and gained thereby much Catholic sup-

port in favour of his scheme. The sequel was, indeed, as Lecky says, "a melancholy and shameful story." Pitt raised the Catholic question in the Cabinet after the Union had been passed, and the inevitable division on the subject broke out at once. Had Pitt felt really deeply on the Catholic question there is scarcely any doubt that he could have overridden the opposition of the King. His resignation had become inevitable since the King adopted the attitude he had been encouraged by Lord Longborough and the anti-Catholics to assume. But Pitt could have returned in triumph within a few months if he had thrown his weight against his successor. Actually, however, when the King's obstinacy compelled him to retire, he resigned with infinite reluctance. He had underrated the strength of the Protestant opposition to his own intentions, and he saw too late that, if he overthrew his successor by insisting upon Catholic emancipation, his own personal influence would be undermined. Besides, he cared nothing for the Irish Catholics; he lived only for personal power.

Ireland had now lost her Parliament and during twenty years after the Union, the cause of Catholic emancipation made little progress. There was much discussion and a sharp division of opinions as to the terms under which Catholics could accept an Emancipation Act that would be passed by the English Parliament. Hence arose the prolonged controversy as to the Veto proposals. A certain section of English Catholics had accepted the principle of the Veto on the appointment of bishops, and their agents were active in Rome promoting their plans. It looked for a time as if they had succeeded, for in April, 1814, Msgr. Quarantotti sent his famous Rescript, dealing with the Veto question, to an English bishop, Dr. Poynter. In the Rescript, Quarantotti expressed approval of the Royal Veto on the appointment of Catholic bishops. The document created great commotion and met with much opposition in Ireland, and in no place more than in Dublin. The Catholics, under the presidency of Dr. Blake, P. P., afterwards Bishop of Dromore, met in the old chapel of Bridge-street, and unanimously declared that the Quarantotti Rescript was non-obligatory on them. Pius VII was then, and had been for four years, a prisoner at Fontainebleau in France. In his absence and

without his sanction, the aged Quarantotti had no power to issue the Rescript. Hence the truth about the whole controversy is that it was "much ado about nothing".

Daniel O'Connell

In England the protracted controversy over the Veto question had left the Catholics so hopelessly divided that the Government felt no necessity to pay any attention to their grievances. In Ireland, on the other hand, the Catholics had already received sufficient relief to advance with considerable rapidity, in every year that passed, towards exerting a decisive influence in the life of the country. With their increase in wealth and their collective influence they became more and more conscious of the degradation involved in their exclusion from Parliament. More and more they identified the vindication of Catholic rights with the demand for political independence. But the passing of the Union made it impossible to treat the Irish Catholics as separate from the English Catholics, and henceforward it was impossible for Pitt to dictate at Westminister, or at Windsor, as he had dictated to the Irish Parliament in 1793. So, when the ignominious collapse of Grattan's ill-fated Catholic Relief Bill in 1813 had shown once and for all that no further hope could be based upon political negotiations in Dublin, the time had clearly come to try a wholly different plan—to fall back upon that method of concentrated agitation in Ireland itself which was discovered by Daniel O'Connell.

O'Connell, one of the biggest Catholic figures that had arisen in Europe since the so-called Reformation, was born in 1775 in the extreme west of County Kerry, of an ancient family of Catholic landowners. He was far from being the vulgar demagogue that English newspapers delighted to paint him. Devotion to his religion was unquestionably the dominating motive throughout his career. His immortality is secured through his triumphant vindication of the Catholic claims by the sheer force of his own energy and genius against overwhelming odds. Gladstone said, "He was the greatest popular leader whom the world has ever seen."

When the Catholic Committee met in 1807 to consider the situation, certain members desired that a petition for the total abrogation of the penal laws should be submitted to the new Parliament at once. Keogh, who had assisted in the drafting and presentation of so many petitions, was of opinion that a continuance of petitioning made their cause appear ridiculous. But O'Connell, "a young barrister who had begun to make a figure at the bar", believed that his own programme of intensive agitation was yet to be tried. O'Connell carried the majority with him, and Keogh, now grown old and infirm, retired from the stage where he had long performed the principal character with such just applause.

The petition was accordingly drafted and O'Connell's name for the first time comes into prominence as one of its promoters. Having gained a clear ascendence on the Catholic Committee, he proceeded to strengthen the whole Catholic organization. His first step was to establish, in 1810, a series of local Catholic Boards which were to act in connection with the General Committee in Dublin. Within a year the Government had put down the Committee by prosecuting some of its members for violating the Convention Act. O'Connell, showing great skill in circumventing offensive legislation, then constituted a new Catholic Board on lines that excluded any attribution of a representative character. But the Government was determined to give no latitude to the Catholics in creating an organization to assert their rights, though it encouraged the formation of Protestant societies that proceeded to intimidate the Catholics by physical violence and brutality. And it dealt ruthlessly with the press when it dared to side with the Catholics in their struggle to achieve their political rights.

Whilst the agitation about the Veto was being carried on, the old movement that O'Connell had tried to galvanise into new life was being disintegrated and demoralized in spite of all his herculean efforts. The leaders had split into two camps—"emancipation with securities", a policy that Grattan had made his own, and "unconditional emancipation" which was O'Connell's. O'Connell's son declared that his father always regarded this as the most trying period of his life. The years dragged along, and the Irish Catholics had almost lost hope of winning Emancipation in

Parliament, except on terms that involved what they regarded as apostasy. In 1821 O'Connell appealed to the Irish people to abandon all efforts to obtain Emancipation until they had secured the Repeal of the Act of Union. From the very beginning, O'Connell had been one of the few Irish Catholics who saw that no Irish Parliament could continue to keep the Catholics down. But when the Relief Bill of 1821 was going through Parliament, he declared that whilst he took no responsibility for it he believed that the Oath of Allegiance it contained might now be conscientiously taken. Though the Commons passed the Bill by a very small majority, the Lords threw it out by a majority of 39.

"In 1823", wrote Richard Lalor Sheil, "an entire cessation of Catholic meetings had taken place. There was a total stagnation of public feeling, and I do not exaggerate when I say that the Catholic question was nearly forgotten." Only a miracle, it seemed, could rouse the Catholics again to assert their rights. O'Connell had been before the country for more than fifteen years. In the spring of 1823 the miracle happened in the unexpected appearance of Dr. Doyle, the young Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, the famous J. K. L. (John, Kildare and Leighlin). His *Vindication of the Religious and Civil Principles of the Irish Catholic,* with its direct challenge to the Protestant Ascendency, brought new hope to the dispirited Catholic body. The reply to this on the part of the Protestants was a proselytising movement that Magee, as its principle organizer, styled "the Second Reformation". Its chief method of conversion consisted in "soup-kitchens" for the purpose of making destitute Catholics break the law of abstinence. At this time the poverty of the Catholic population, that had grown enormously, was zealously watched by these so-called philanthropic societies. But the voice of J. K. L. was that of a new generation suddenly finding expression. Almost before it had realized it had gained courage enough to assert itself with the emergence of J. K. L., a still more momentous development was taking place, and was aided by the re-union of Richard Lalor Sheil and O'Connell who had been estranged for some years. A new Catholic Association was the result, with Lord Killeen as chairman, the clergy being honorary members *ex officio,* and sub-

scriptions being the only requisites. The whole plan, however, seemed to be hanging fire until O'Connell put new life into it at a meeting in Dublin when he instituted the "Catholic Rent", or parish collections throughout the whole country. The collection began in March, and by September it was producing £200 a week, but by December it averaged £1000 a week. The funds were to be used for five special purposes: parliamentary expenses, press propaganda, legal expenses, protection of Catholics, Catholic education among the poor, and education of Catholic priests for America. Careful to avoid any possibility of incurring further prosecutions under the Convention Act, O'Connell had so constituted the new Association that it could not possibly be regarded as a representative body. Membership was open to everyone, Catholic or Protestant, who was willing to subscribe, and its meetings were always open.

In England the amazing growth of this new agitation was watched with increasing anxiety. Even to George IV, "the proceedings of the collective bodies of that Catholic persuasion in Ireland seem to be little short of what may fairly be termed intended rebellion." But the absence of any provocation to the Government gave its unique character to O'Connell's agitation, which was one of popular discontent. At the end of 1824 O'Connell and Sheil crossed to England for the furtherance of their agitation, but in February, 1825, the King's speech declared the Association "irreconcilable with the constitution" and "calculated to endanger the peace of society and to retard the course of national improvement." Within a fortnight a Bill was carried through both Houses for the *Suppression of Unlawful Associations in Ireland.* At the same time the Government sought to solve the Catholic question by an ignominious compromise. It would admit Catholics to Parliament and the Municipal Corporations on two conditions: the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling free-holders and a subsidy to the Catholic clergy by the British Government.

The fact that the Bill to give effect to these concessions passed through the Commons shows the enormous pressure that had been exercised by O'Connell's agitation. But O'Connell was to incur

much obloquy afterwards for having consented to the two conditions or "wings" of the Emancipation Bill. When, however, it was thrown out in the Lords, O'Connell, becoming alarmed at the agitation he had created, made a formal retraction and apology for his weakness. His reception in Dublin on his return showed no diminution of his popularity. The old struggle must begin all over again, and once again O'Connell rallied the whole people with his magnetic genius as an orator and an organizer. A loophole in the Act of Suppression of Unlawful Associations in Ireland was not lost to his legal acumen. The "New Catholic Association" was to be formed for the entirely legal purpose "of public or private charity, and such other purposes as are not prohibited by the statute of George IV. Cap. 4." The old weekly rent was collected precisely as before, the money ostensibly being required "for the relief of distressed Catholics". O'Connell's announcement was received with wild excitement and rejoicings, and the bitterness created by his acceptance of the "wings" quickly vanished.

In 1826 the dissolution of Parliament and a general election offered a new opportunity for a trial of strength between the Catholic democracy, now fully organized, and their opponents. It was only at the last minute that O'Connell decided that a test should be made in trying to rally the forty-shilling freeholders to support candidates recommended by the Association. Had he anticipated the immediate success of his first attempt, preparations would have been completed in every district before the general elections, and the victory of 1829 might have been brought about three years earlier. The first trial of strength came about at Waterford. Lord George Beresford, the parliamentary representative for twenty years, a local landowner of hereditary power and strong personal claims, and a vehement opponent of Catholic emancipation, was opposed by O'Connell's candidate, Villiers Stuart, son of the Marquis of Bute, and an important landlord in the county. All the odds were in favour of Beresford, but it was the very strength of this lord's position which made O'Connell choose this arena for his first contest, and throw all his energy into the campaign. An amazing change came over the whole sys-

tem of election. Instead of Beresford's usual election by a mere show of hands, the Catholic voters against him arrived in such numbers that he indignantly demanded a poll. This meant that the election would last a month, every voter being obliged to declare his vote in public. O'Connell extemporised a whole system of electioneering. From every district in the county the forty-shilling freeholders were marched into Waterford City, accompanied by their wives and children. Arrangements for feeding and billeting them were rapidly made. For six days the people, bedecked with the green ribbons of the Association, and carrying green branches, and singing as they came, marched defiantly to record their votes for Stuart. Every tenant who came to vote against Beresford was risking his whole liberty and livelihood. After six days Beresford retired from the contest, having polled only 528 against 1,357. There was no ground on which he could appeal against the election, except that of moral intimidation by the clergy, as O'Connell had enforced strict temperance while the election lasted. The election was an absolutely peaceful one, and the 4,000 troops brought to keep the peace could only stand by helplessly.

O'Connell was amazed at the success of his scheme; for thirty years the Catholic freeholders had possessed the vote but they had never dared to use it in their own cause. There now seemed no further possibility of preventing the Catholics from storming the citadels all over the country. There was still time, in this general election, to develop similar contests. Louth, Monaghan, Westmeath, and other places mobilized their strength, and drove the opponents of the Catholic claims out of Parliament. The old order had fallen like a pack of cards. A further opportunity for a trial of strength was given by the vacancy in Clare caused by the appointment of its member Vesey Fitzgerald as a cabinet minister. Reluctantly, and as a last resort, O'Connell agreed to oppose Fitzgerald. His election address is worth recording:

> You will be told I am not qualified to be elected. The assertion, my friends, is untrue. I am qualified to be elected, and to be your representative. It is true that as a Catholic I cannot, and of course never will, take the oaths at present prescribed to members of Parliament;

but the authority which created these oaths—the Parliament—can abrogate them, and I entertain a confident hope that, if you elect me, the most bigoted of our enemies will see the necessity of removing from the chosen representative of the people an obstacle which would prevent him from doing his duty to his King and his country. The oath at present required by law is "that the Sacrifice of the Mass and the invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary and other saints, as now practised in the Church of Rome, are impious and idolatrous." Of course, I will never stain my soul with such an oath. I leave that to my honourable opponent, Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald. He has often taken that horrible oath. He is ready to take it again, and ask your votes to enable him so to swear. I would be rather torn limb from limb than take it.

O'Connell's journey to Clare, June 28, 1828, was in the nature of a triumphal march, the people assembling in thousands, in the towns through which his green barouche passed, to greet him and bid him God speed. After almost two days and two nights driving, O'Connell and his companions arrived at Ennis, where they were met at 2 o'clock in the morning by the people and the trades with bands and banners, bonfires blazing on the hills, and rushlights burning in the cabin windows. During five days the polling continued, and O'Connell more than doubled his opponent's votes. Excitement and rejoicing were intense when the sheriff announced the tremendous news that O'Connell had been elected for Clare. Wilder still was the enthusiasm of the country on his return journey to Dublin. Over 60,000 in Ennis alone assembled to bid him farewell. In Dublin, where a vast meeting was arranged on the day of his arrival, he stated in his speech: "What I now say I wish to reach England, and I ask, what is to be done with Ireland? One of two things: they must either crush us or conciliate us. There is no going on as we are; there is nothing so dangerous as going on as we are." It was a direct challenge to the Government.

To the Protestant ascendency the Clare election had been the deathblow of their long dominion. In a letter to Sir Walter Scott, Sir Robert Peel gave his own impressions of the amazing scenes that had been taking place in Clare:

I wish you had been present at the Clare election, for no pen but yours could have done justice to that fearful exhibition of sobered and des-

perate enthusiasm. "Be true" was the watchword which, uttered by a priest or an agitator, calmed in an instant the stormy wave of the multitude, and seduced the freeholder from his allegiance to his Protestant landlord. We were watching the movements of tens of thousands of disciplined fanatics, abstaining from every excess and every indulgence, and concentrating every passion and feeling on one single object; with hundreds of police and soldiers, half of whom were Roman Catholics—that half, faithful and prepared, I have no doubt, to do their duty. But is it consistent with common prudence and common sense to repeat such scenes and to incur such risks of contagion?

The Duke of Wellington had also discerned the writing on the wall, confronted as he was with a situation in which surrender seemed more and more inevitable. Bishop Doyle's open letter to him, on the eve of the election, doubtless had an incalculable influence on him. "We are a nation grown up to manhood", he said, "and the only force which can subdue us, without ruin to the State, is the force of equity." A problem of immeasurable menace had been created by O'Connell's victory, and he was too shrewd to commit himself in haste. To arrive at Westminster and demand his seat would have been to invite disaster. He wisely waited to see what effect his election would produce, and devoted his energies to keeping in control the widespread agitation of his people, which was a fearful problem. But his organization was so perfect that his voice filtered through to the remotest parts of the country.

The situation had become utterly impossible for the dropsical King, whose irritability was forcing him to a disastrous decision to dissolve Parliament, regardless of the prospect of Catholics being elected all over the country. Wellington's plain statement of fact that the "influence of these demagogues" was "paralyzing the royal authority itself" did much to bring the King to his senses, and to show him that conciliation was the only policy. When Parliament assembled, February 5, 1829, His Majesty recommended it to

review the laws which impose disabilities on His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. You will consider whether the removal of these disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and permanent security of our establishments in Church and State, with the maintenance of the reformed

religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the bishops and of the clergy of this nation, and of the churches committed to their charge.

Peel, having resigned his seat, and having returned to Parliament, gave notice that he would call attention to the disabilities of the Roman Catholics. For five hours the infirm King protested in indignation and tears against the policy that Peel and Wellington had already persuaded him to sanction. But they refused to recede from their position, and left him, having delivered their threat to resign. Scarcely had they returned to London when word followed them from Windsor that the King had capitulated. For four hours on March 5 Peel expounded the situation to the House, which began to wonder at the difficulties that had been raised around an issue that involved so slight a change in the character of Parliament. The central provisions of the Government bills were simply the removal of the obnoxious declarations of allegiance and supremacy, and the substitution of a rigmarole which declared that the member does not believe "the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign Prince, Prelate, Person, State or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm." The Continental Divinity Faculties and O'Connell himself had already professed so much.

The Catholic Emancipation Bill proceeded through Parliament, and on Monday, April 13, the King's ministers appeared stubbornly at the Castle to request the royal signature. The King was helpless and hysterical. He would not look at the document he was asked to sign. Finally, Wellington prevailed. The King scribbled the few necessary letters across the parchment, and then flung the pen furiously to the ground. When Peel heard later in the day that all was now over, he remarked that "the Bill has now passed its last and most difficult stage."

To the vast majority of Catholics the Bill did signify an unconditional surrender to their demand for full political rights. O'Connell's chief personal triumph lay in the fact that the Veto and all other provisions for Government interference with the Church had been kept out. And to obtain this Act, O'Connell agreed to

disfranchise the forty-shilling freeholders (the new qualification for the vote was £10), the bulk of the Catholic voters of Ireland, to allow new restrictions on the religious orders, to re-enact the prohibition of Catholic religious services outside churches and private houses. Does this then deserve the name of Catholic Emancipation? Should not the centenary of Emancipation have been celebrated in Ireland in 1893 and not in 1929?

On a long view, no. The defects of the Act were bound to be remedied in the course of time. As Professor O'Sullivan, Minister of Education in the Irish Free State, stated recently,

> it was a sound political instinct which led the mass of the Irish Catholics to acclaim Emancipation as a great victory. . . . The enfranchisement of the Emancipation Act was the necessary first step in any real advance, even political advance, to nationalist victory. The advancement of the Catholic Cause was at the same time that of the national cause. O'Connell emerged from young manhood with two anchors, religion and liberty. The Ireland of his day gave him the opportunity—so rare in contemporary Europe—of uniting both. Catholicity and democracy were then rarely seen in combination. Europe learned from him. His example inspired national leaders in other countries. His was honoured in Belgium and the Rhineland, as well as in Bohemia. French Catholic liberals recognized his greatness. Through him, Ireland again, after centuries, entered into the European family.

"The history of the platform", says Mr. MacDonagh, "as the symbol of mankind's struggle against oppression and wrong, shows no more wonderful example of the witching power of speech. O'Connell, as an orator, swept with a sure touch that stormy harp whose strings are the hearts of men, and from Ireland its vibrations passed around the globe." [11] O'Connell was the first in the world's history to arouse to activity the enormous power of public opinion which was stored up and lying dormant in the community, and he was the first to organize it for political and social action on constitutional lines. He was the inventor of popular agitation as it is now practiced in all democratic and constitutionally governed countries.

MYLES V. RONAN.

---

[11] Michael MacDonagh, *O'Connell as a World-Power.* (*Catholic Emancipation Centenary Record; Daniel O'Connell, and the Story of Catholic Emancipation*, Dublin, 1929.)

CARDINAL POLE AND THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

The purpose of this paper is to draw attention to an apostle of Christian Unity whose greatness and significance have been often neglected because of the seeming failure of his life. When Reginald Pole was born on March 3, 1500, there was as yet no problem of Christian Unity, because there was as yet no disunion of Christendom. When he died on November 17, 1558, that union which he had devoted his life to preserve went with his body to the grave. He lived, therefore, at a time when the lines of feeling, thought, and action in regard to Christian Unity were not as now converging but diverging. He had to face a problem in the making, and the novelty and magnitude, not to say malignity of the forces of disruption evoked in him a resourcefulness and a passion of energy which makes his life worth study.[1]

I propose to say something about Pole's preparation for his apostolate, to study the principles which are revealed in his writings, and the policy he pursued in the conduct of affairs, to touch here and there on the price, in terms of sacrifice, which he paid for his apostleship, and to watch him in the brief joy of that consummation when he absolved a whole nation from heresy and

[1] This study is based on the material collected by Cardinal Angelo Maria Quirini in his edition in five volumes of the *Epistolae Reginaldi Poli* (1744-1751); on the writings of Pole, particularly the *Pro Ecclesiasticae Unitatis Defensione* (1536) and the *De Summo Pontifice* (1539); and on the copies or summaries of sources published by Brewer and Gairdner, Rawdon Brown and Gayangos. I am indebted to Martin Haile, *Life of Reginald Pole* (1911) for a few quotations from British Museum Mss. The best general Life of Pole is that by Athanasius Zimmermann, S. J., *Kardinal Pole, sein Leben und seine Schriften* (1893), though the older *Life* by Thomas Phillips (2 vols., 1764, with Appendix, 1767) has not lost its value. In Quirini, besides the correspondence of Pole, there may be found a Life of Pole, in Italian, by his secretary Beccatelli, the important *Apologia ad Carolum V*, an *Epistola ad Eduardum Regem*, a graphic account by an eye-witness of Pole's triumphant return to England in 1554, and many historical and controversial disquisitions by Cardinal Quirini.

schism and made his severed country once more a living part in the Kingdom of Christ upon earth.

I

At the age of seven, Reginald Pole left behind him the noise of the spurred boots and the clash of arms and the princely paraphernalia of his parents' court in Ludlow Castle and was sent to school to the Carthusians at Sheen. When Henry VIII succeeded to the throne in 1509, he was fond of his young cousin Reginald, and ambitioned for him that career in the Church which had once been destined for himself. Hence, when Pole went up to Oxford with a scholarship at Magdalen, the Prior of St. Frideswide was bidden by the king to give a yearly pension to the boy.

The Oxford that Pole knew bore the stamp of that somewhat languid English Renaissance which provoked the over generous praises of Erasmus. Aging Linacre, who had taught Erasmus (and also Thomas More), was still lecturing, while Grocyn and Latimer were trying with young ardor to impose neo-Hellenic ideals on what they considered palaeo-Scholastic routine. By 1519, Pole was a Master of Arts, and was offered a fellowship at Corpus. But he was saved from what might have been a period of intellectual torpor by the advice of friends who urged him to go to Padua. King Henry, too, was glad to have so clever a kinsman representing him in Venetian territory.

Padua at the time was on the very crest of a wave of Renaissance intellectualism. Yet from the moment of his arrival the young Englishman became a dominating figure in that circle of scholars, as is clear both from his correspondence with men like Erasmus, Bembo, Sadoleto, Ghiberti and the young Belgian de Longueil, as also from the many testimonies which the pious care of Quirini has collected.[2]

Pole was still at Padua when he was called upon in a small but significant matter to make a choice between his conscience and the king. For the year 1525 a Jubilee had been announced to a still practically undivided Christendom. In the same year, for

[2] See Gasquet, *Cardinal Pole and his Early Friends*. London, 1927.

the first time Archbishop Warham of Canterbury wrote to Cardinal Wolsey of "the great matter of the king's grace", meaning of course the royal scruple in regard to his marriage with Catherine of Aragon. About the same time the Lady Salisbury was bidden to recall her son Reginald to England. Pole did not obey, as had been his wont, at once. He wrote for the king's permission to go, instead, to Rome. The plenary indulgence of the Jubilee had, it seems, an urgence more imperative than the wishes of the king. It is further significant that Henry gave his consent only on conditions. Pole was to travel incognito and was to pay no official visit to the Pope.

After the visit to Rome Pole lingered still in Italy. When at last in 1527 he returned to England he was shocked by the increasing coarseness of the king. With a keen sense of disillusionment, Pole retreated in disgust to his dear solitude at Sheen, and sought in the study of the Fathers solace for a disillusioned heart. Meanwhile the king was writing love letters in French to a coquette of twenty, whose sister he had already sullied, and was, at the same time, making a mockery of law and conscience by having himself summoned before the Archbishop's Court on a charge of incest with the widow of his brother. Pole found it increasingly difficult to conceal his feelings. One day the secretary of Wolsey came to sympathize and instruct him with a manuscript copy of Machiavelli. The conversation that ensued has been preserved for us in the *Apologia ad Carolum V*: "In my judgment", said Pole, "it is the part of a royal counsellor to consult above all else the honor and the good of the king." To which Cromwell replied: "That policy is useless in our secret councils; it lacks relish . . . it generates disgust . . . and dislike. . . . What is to the point is this, to search out diligently the bearings of the prince's will. . . . That is the short cut to have favor and power with princes." [3]

Machiavellianism, then, had become constitutive of the new spirit of the Tudor monarchy. The flattery of a prince's passions was become the chief virtue of a statesman. In disgust Pole asked if he might leave England. Curiously enough the king

[3] Quirini: I, 133-135.

agreed that Pole might go to Paris to continue his studies in theology. The reason of this ready compliance Pole only discovered after his arrival in Paris. Thomas Cranmer had in fact already "gotten the right sow by the lug", and Henry thought that Pole would be useful in Paris in securing a favorable verdict in the matter of the marriage. "Nothing in my whole life", Pole wrote later to the king, "pained me more than the mandate you gave me in Paris. The one reason for my exile was that I might have no part in those counsels which at your own instigation were working you harm."[4] At the time he pleaded diplomatically his lack of skill in such matters. In the event, the actual work of collecting votes was done by Sir Francis Bryant and Edward Fox. By July 7, 1530, Pole was again sick at heart, and begged to return to England.

With Pole back in England, Henry fondly hoped that his cousin might be proselytized as even Gardiner had been by Cromwell's insistent question: "Is not that that pleaseth the King a law? Have ye not that in the civil laws *quod principi placuit?*" Henry even thought of bribing Pole by offering him the Archbishopric of York. The Duke of Norfolk was in fact sent with the royal message to Sheen. Nothing was required, he said, but a few complaisant words in favor of the royal divorce. Pole rejected the simony with scorn. His sole ambition, he said, was the sincere service of the king, not benefices. The Duke turned theologian and urged the official arguments. In vain. Then he lowered his voice. He wished to speak as a friend. There was peril in Pole's *nolo episcopari.* A subject may not with impunity condemn even tacitly the conduct of the king. Again in vain. Then came a sharper shaft. Pole had relations. His brothers were in fact trying desperately to trim their sails to the changing favors of the king. They urged on Reginald that like a good sailor he should tack for a time in the hope of quiet waters ahead. Pole's effort of resistance for a moment weakened. A fleshly temptation blurred his spiritual vision. He asked for a month to think things over. Then a meeting was arranged at York House. He felt he

[4] *De Unitate,* fol. lxxvii.

had discovered a compromise. But the moment he looked on Henry, whom he loved sincerely, the whole fabric of his nervously excogitated compromise tumbled to pieces. For a moment he was speech-bound. Then like a flood the disciplined integrity of years broke its way through the accumulated casuistry and tangled introspections of a month. Not one of his convictions did he withhold from Henry. The king was startled and baffled. Then the Tudor anger rose. The royal cheeks flushed. A hand went to his sword. For a moment, as he later confessed, he thought to kill Pole on the spot. But he was conquered by a candor so rare. "I will think this over", he said; and slamming the door left Pole alone in the gallery, tears in his eyes, but thanking God that his tongue had been held from flattery.

That is the story as Pole tells it himself in the *Epistola ad Eduardum Regem*,[5] and as it appears in the *Vita* by Beccatelli.[6] The meeting was followed by a letter in which Pole sets forth every argument, spiritual, personal and political, which he could muster to prevent the king from taking, as Pole said, "the last false step into the water of dishonor."[7]

Henry, however, had other counsellors. Cromwell in particular was realizing to the full that picture of a Machiavellian statesman which he had sketched for Pole. Papal admonitions, he said, should be answered by the repudiation of papal authority; and he found it easy to persuade the king that ownership of ecclesiastical possessions was a logical deduction from the Headship of the Church. To Pole, as he wrote in the *Apologia*, it seemed that Cromwell was but tempting the king, first by raising him to the pinnacle of the Temple, then by showing him the lands of the monks, with the words of Satan: "See all these will I give thee."[8] Events in England moved rapidly. On the 11th of May, 1531, Convocation declared Henry the Head of the Church in England. Pole saw his country severed from the unity of Christendom, and he felt called upon to choose between England and the Kingdom

[5] Quirini: IV, 306-353.
[6] Quirini: V, 356.
[7] Strype: *Memorials*, II, 379.
[8] Quirini: I, 121.

of God. The choice was hard. "Two loves", he wrote to his friend Priuli, "are ineradicable in my heart: the love of country which nature has implanted, and that for the Church which is a grace from the Son of God." Grace triumphed over nature. In 1532, Pole felt that residence in England was incompatible with his conscience as a Catholic, and he entered upon that exile which was to last for twenty-two years.

It was a decisive sacrifice for the cause of Christian Unity; and it would be surprising if the correspondence of this time did not reveal the evidence of some marked supernatural favors. The letters do in fact show a sharpening of spiritual vision, a new keenness of conscience, a more mystical apprehension of the indwelling of God in the soul, a shifting of emphasis from material means to spiritual ends, a profounder realization of the visible Church as being not only the true expression but the sole bulwark of interior religion. England he looks upon with sincere love because he sees it purely as a severed province in the Kingdom of God. It was this supernatural temper of mind which he brought to the composition of his greatest work, *De Ecclesiasticae Unitatis Defensione,* in defense of Christian Unity.

II

On February 15, 1525, a letter written by Starkey, his former chaplain, asked Pole for his frank opinion on the divorce and the new Headship of the Church in England. He was asked to write "truly and plain without color or dark of dissimulation which his Grace most princely abhorreth."[9] What stimulated Pole was the advanced Protestantism and Erastianism of the letter:

> For although the king had withdrawn himself from the Pope's authority, he has in no point slid from the certain and sure ground of Scripture; nor yet from the laws and ceremonies of the Church, which yet stand in full strength and authority; and so they shall, boldly I dare affirm, until the king and his Council think expedient to abrogate them and substitute by common consent others more agreeable to this time and the nature of our men and more convenient to our whole country.

[9] Haile, 137.

In answer to further letters begging him to state his position on these "great and weighty causes", Pole wrote on April 12, that he would do his best. By the 21st he was busy at work, but with the coming of the hot weather he was forced to desist. It was a physical rest without mental repose. Early in May came the news of the martyrdom of his dear friend, the Brigittine Richard Reynolds of Sion. On June 22, Fisher who had been raised to the purple by the pope was brought by the king to the block. Two weeks later Sir Thomas More, another dear friend of Pole, was martyred in the same cause. When Pole resumed his task in September his mind was so moved by the memory of these tragedies that he filled his pages with pathetic outbursts of affection. The beautiful and passionate panegyric on More takes up ten quarto pages in the *De Unitate*.[10] Meanwhile from England he received two tracts containing the official arguments of the royal theologians on Papal Succession and the Headship of the Church. For the formal refutation of these arguments further study was required. But what took most time was the prayerful preparation of a final exhortation urging upon Henry the need of supernatural repentance. It was not before Easter of 1536 that the last sheets were ready for Cardinal Contarini, who was acting as a friendly censor.

It is little wonder that there is something tumultuous both in the style and the arrangement of a work written under the stress of such cross-currents of indignation and affection, of pity and personal affliction, of *odium theologicum,* and of apostolic zeal. I shall not attempt here what even the painstaking analysis of Father Zimmermann[11] fails to reveal, namely, an adequate and consecutive summary of the work's purpose, content, form, characteristics and significance. Suffice it to say that the substance of the work which was originally intended to be a private letter to King Henry is to be found in what is labeled Book III. in the later printed editions.

After pointing out with an almost modern psychological perception that Henry has rendered himself by his reckless conduct

[10] Fol. xc.

[11] *Kard. Pole,* 89-104.

unsusceptible of supernatural truth, Pole boldly sketches the story of the king's passion for Anne Boleyn and then analyses the effects of the king's fall. The first and foremost effect was the sundering of a nation from its normal place in the *respublica christiana.* The consequence of this was a series of bloody martyrdoms which robbed England of some of her noblest sons. This in turn spells ruin both for the Church and the nation. The other consequence of the king's passion was the disinheritance of a legitimate heiress. This promises political trouble, for it raises the problem of a disputed succession. Parallel with the king's separation from the unity of Christendom is his break with the medieval constitutional tradition, expressed in the aphorism: *Propter populum igitur Rex, non populus propter Regem*—"The king is for the people, not the people for the sake of the king".[12] Henry is guilty of two grave sins: schism and tyranny. He has merited therefore not only the censures of Christendom but the interference of Christian princes. The hearts of Englishmen, says Pole, are not so cold, the love of true religion in England is not so dead, the sense of tyranny is not so blunt but that those who have suffered should look to Caesar for assistance. To the student of the genuine European tradition of liberty the technical treason of this part of the *De Unitate* is of no slight significance.

Such, very briefly is what Pole had already written when he received the tracts of Gardiner and Bishop Sampson of Chichester, dealing with the Headship of the Church and the Jurisdiction of the Apostolic See. These arguments Pole answers and then sets forth the counter arguments from Catholic theological tradition.

Sampson argued thus: we have a duty to honor the king, as the highest authority in the land. Hence we must accept his jurisdiction in religion no less than in political affairs. Pole answers: the view is novel and theologically untenable and the fact is a monstrous perversion. For fifteen hundred years men had found it easy to honor the king without entrenching on the rights which Christ gave to the Church and without breaking the unity of

[12] *De Unitate*, f. xxii. *Cf. De Regimine Principum*, III, 2. Also Fortescue: *Governance of England*, Chap. VIII.

Christendom into meaningless fragments. If arguments are needed they may be found in abundance in the Old and New Testament and in tradition. Moreover, as a historical fact, honoring the king has meant robbing the people of England to fill the coffers of the king.

Sampson attacked the right of the pope to the powers of Peter. Peter, he says, were he alive today would disavow his wicked successor. Pole answers that legitimacy does not depend on private virtue. If it did there would be episcopal succession nowhere; least of all in England. But, says Sampson, the papal yoke on England was intolerable. To which Pole answers: not all the popes together have imposed such burdens on the Church in England as the king has imposed by his robberies in the last three years. Pole then sets forth the positive arguments for papal jurisdiction over the universal Church. It is not a question of conveniences or abuses but a matter of historical fact. Christ established one Church with a monarchical head and nothing men can do or think or feel will ever alter that unshakable constitution whose origin and purpose are divine. That, as Pole saw clearly, is the crux in the problem of Christian Unity. The substance of the somewhat lengthy and elaborately rhetorical exordium and of the sincere and even paternally earnest peroration exhorting Henry to repentance do not add to the main point of Pole's thought, and so need not detain us here.[13]

The gist of the book as a whole may perhaps best be expressed in Pole's forcible phrase that Henry's Headship of the Church is a ridiculous claim since it leads to the conclusion that Nero was the spiritual superior of St. Paul.

III

It is time to turn from Pole's abstract principles of Christian Unity to his actual policy in the conduct of affairs. To understand this policy we must remember that Pole's central preoccupation was with Christendom as a whole, while his guiding principle was Christian tradition. His mind had risen to the top-

[13] *De Unitate*, fol. x.

most peaks of Renaissance culture and he had surveyed the ever widening horizons of thought and feeling. Yet his feet were fixed firmly on the past. He realized with a penetration and a prevision which today we can appreciate, that progress towards political and religious nationalism may involve a moral and spiritual retrogression. Pole doubted, to use his own words, whether the separation of the shoots from the branches, or of the trunk from the roots, means an escape into newer life. He trusted rather in the experience that an old tree can produce new fruit. To him Henry's work was negative. He had put the axe to good roots instead of lopping the dead twigs.

In July, 1535, Contarini urged Paul III to call the Englishman to Rome. Pole was thus bidden to make in person that decision which even as an opinion was treason in England. On August 1, through his old friend Tunstall, Pole informed the king that the Vicar of Christ had conquered, though he confessed that a pleading letter from his mother tried him sorely. When a cardinal's hat was offered him, he pleaded that to accept it might lessen the power for good which he still exercised in the hearts of Englishmen. However, Paul III insisted. Pole's secretary and biographer, Beccatelli, hesitates to decide whether the action of the pope was due to an inspiration of God or to the wire-pulling of imperial agents. Those agents in fact had hopes that "with the help of the Church and the said Signore", Charles V might be able to grasp the crown of England. The fact serves to remind us that the recluse of Padua had to the secret diplomacy of Europe a significance altogether foreign to his personal aspirations. As early as September 27, 1533, the imperial agent, Chapuys, hinted to the emperor that Pole might make a good consort for Princess Mary of England. A year later, Martin de Cornoça, writing from Venice, drew attention to Pole's royal blood and to his popularity with the Catholic malcontents in England. Early in 1535, Chapuys again coupled Pole's name with the growing discontent of the conservatives in England. Pole could hardly have been ignorant of this interest in his person, but at this very time Henry's most watchful spies could find no evidence of Pole's political ambitions. Nevertheless, it is abundantly clear from Pole's writ-

ings and from his correspondence that he desired the emperor and the pope by arms or by censures to frighten Henry into religious reunion. *Timere cogatur:* "Let him be forced to fear" is an explicit statement in one of his letters. He is equally clear in regard to his motive. "This is not my business", he says, "but it concerns the honor of the pope and the good of the Church." [14] In any case Pole only accepted a policy of imperial compulsion when he was convinced of the wishes of the English people and of the insincerity of the king in professing a desire for reconciliation with Rome. When Pole heard of this desire he wrote: "This return to the obedience of the Pope is a fiction. With the Emperor about to demand the justice of the laws in a matter concerning the whole Christian Commonweal, these agents are trying to stave off active measures by pretending to negotiate a voluntary return to the Church." With this conviction Pole wrote earnestly to his friend Priuli: "I wish that your Reverence would take upon yourself to show the Emperor how meritorious it is in the eyes of God to defend and protect the interests of the Church." [15] He adds a little later: "I must speak so until some can show me that this matter which I urge so often is not, as I think it to be, the cause of Christ and His Church".[16] When in fact the Pilgrimage of Grace was afoot Chapuys wrote to Charles V: "If the Pope would send Reginald Pole with funds, matters would be remedied in a moment," [17] and the Papal Nuncio in Paris wrote to Rome: "I should think Pole could do service to God by going to England whenever any insurrection may arise."

On February 7, 1537, Pole was in fact dispatched with Legatine powers to England. It is clear from the Instructions which he drafted himself that he was anxious to be in England before the Parliament of York, so that he could act by constitutional measures rather than by force. And in any case all he desired, as he says in his draft, was "that the king should restore everything to the state in which it was before the disorders began;" and again in a letter: "My single commission in regard to that island

[14] Quirini: I, 440.
[15] *Ibid.*, 445.
[16] *Ibid.*, 450.
[17] Haile, 186.

which is restless because tossed about on the waves of doctrines is to bring it back to its ancient stability, so that there may be quiet and security for the country, honor for the king, peace for the Church and glory for Christ. . . . I stood for mild measures, though many opposed me. . . . If I am a traitor to the King of England, that is my treason." [18]

Pole did not so much feel that he was working *against* the king as *for* the people of England. "I do not doubt", he wrote to the pope, "that there are many Englishmen, who are devoted to Your Holiness and to the Holy See though they dare not show this openly." [19] If a last indication of his singleness of purpose be required it may be found, where we should least expect it, in a letter of one of Cromwell's spies who wrote that, Catholic Unity restored, Pole would take off his cardinal's hat, retire to a hermitage, remain in exile, burn his book, work solely for Henry's glory and submit to any other conditions which the king should name. Pole himself wrote in the same sense to Contarini in a letter of August 4, 1536.[20]

On January 18, 1537, Cromwell invited Pole to a friendly discussion of differences in Flanders. The mission ended in smoke. Then Charles V called Pole to Toledo to discuss the affairs of England. The emperor was at last convinced of the unpopularity of Henry's tyranny. Pole was welcomed warmly. But the winter and Henry's agents cooled imperial piety. Charles found that the Turks and the Lutherans took up his whole energies, and besides he would have to consult first with the King of France.[21]

Thus Pole's effort to effect a religious reunion by means of either a personal conversion or of international interference had failed. "I tried", he wrote later in an *Apologia ad Angliae Parliamentum*, "to make the king acceptable to God, to men and to himself." [22] He failed in this. "Perhaps", he wrote to Contarini in 1539, "God wills to find a way to the security of Christendom by a peace between their Majesties of Spain and France." [23] Pole tried that means, too, and failed.

[18] Quirini: II, 37.
[19] *Ibid.*, IV, 41.
[20] *Ibid.*, I, 475.
[21] *Ibid.*, II, 150.
[22] *Ibid.*, IV, 181.
[23] *Ibid.*, II, 150.

"I will not deny", he wrote in the *Epistola ad Eduardum*, "that when love and affection had failed, I urged that threats should be used and that all civil and commercial relations with Henry should be broken." [24] That policy failed too. But Pole was not the man to cease from effort because the Holy Roman Emperor and the Most Christian King were betraying the religious unity of Christendom by failing to fulfill what Pole considered their primary obligations in the European system. To the solution of that great problem there were other avenues of approach.

IV

From the start Pole realized that the problem of Christian Unity was aggravated by the presence of real abuses even in the center of Christendom. Such abuses he knew were a pretext rather than a reason for disunion. What shocked Pole most when he went to Rome, was to find there something of that atmosphere of flattery and corruption which he had sought to escape in fleeing from the Tudor court. He found that outside the circle of some zealous reformers, no argument seemed too specious to justify a languid conservatism and a purely negative hostility to the new forces of disunion. Pole found even high ecclesiastics urging that to examine, let alone to reform, abuses was to give a handle to the Protestants. However, Paul III was on the side of Pole and in fact entrusted to him the drafting of the famous *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*. What is for our present purpose especially noteworthy is that Pole emphasizes everywhere the disruptive consequences of the abuses which the commission condemned. Thus in speaking of excessive centralization, the document points out that this is straining provincial loyalty. Indiscriminate ordinations were leading to a spirit of local anticlericalism. Papal provisions in England had alienated the most devoted children of the Church. Even pilgrimages to Rome had become promptings to spiritual rebellion. The venality of the Penitentiary and Datary were provoking bishops to hostility. Pole sought a new orientation in constructive ideas. He pointed out for example

[24] Quirini: IV, 338.

that only a reform of clerical education would strike at the root of scandals. It was this idea which was so fruitfully taken up by the Council of Trent, and which Pole himself reduced into practise when he returned to England.

In 1542, Pole was chosen along with Cardinals Parisio and Morone to go to Trent. He was at this time as Pallavicino, the historian of the Council, says: "A man deeply versed in theology and honored by all by reason of his holiness of life, his nobility of birth and the glory of exile which he endured in defense of the See of Rome." When the Council opened on December 13, 1545, Pole was one of its three Presidents. Unfortunately after six months his health failed him and he was forced to leave Trent. What marks Pole's contribution to the discussions was his fear lest needless logomachy should endanger Christian peace. Like his friend Contarini he was ever searching for dogmatic formulae which while rigidly orthodox might be also acceptable to those who were faltering in the Faith. This sympathetic understanding of separated brethren is particularly noticeable in Pole's personal relations with fallen-away Catholics. His sweet sanctity achieved permanent conquests for the old Faith when all other means had failed. It was so, for example, with young Marcantonio Flaminio. That unfortunate undergraduate was deep in pride, heresy and other infidelities. Pole invited the brilliant prodigal to his villa. First he talked classics till the young humanist felt flattered. Then he discussed the Scriptures. Lastly, as Beccatelli says, "he proceeded with dexterity, in course of time making him feel at home, and then without effort made him so receptive of Catholic truth that his Faith remained permanently clear and sound".[25]

On January 28, 1547, King Henry died. Pole in hope wrote to the Council of King Edward. His patriotic but pathetic optimism was answered first by hesitating politeness, and finally by astute and studiously curt letters penned by the young Secretary William Cecil. Pole tried a long letter to the king himself, the *Epistola ad Eduardum* which takes up nearly fifty pages in Quirini.[26] It is a splendid *apologia pro vita sua* and there is

[25] Quirini: V, 387.

[26] Vol. IV, 306-353.

much in it that illustrates Pole's principles and policy in regard to the unity of the Church. But I must content myself with a single characteristic quotation, taken from the final appeal of the king: "Do not be led", writes Pole, "by mere public opinion nor by those who have reaped honors and riches out of your father's revolution in religion. Stay your steps. Give heed to the warnings of one who sees snares and perils ahead, of one who could have had riches and honors, but who refused what neither his conscience nor the true good of your father would permit."

Pole's detachment from honor was soon to be put to a severe test, when by a nod of the head he could have become the Supreme Pontiff of the Christian world. Paul III died on November 10, 1549. The conclave opened on November 29. On the next day Matteo Dandolo wrote to the Venetian Signoria that the odds were in favor of the Cardinal of England.[27] On December 4, Pole had the required majority less two. Cardinal Farnese in fact proposed the *adoratio*. Pole refused—"an example the like of which", says Beccatelli, "I have not seen nor read about." "The man is a lump of wood, to be unmoved by the hope of so high an office", was another comment. "Rather he ought to be thought an angel", said a third. Pole himself said with as much humor as humility that he was like a donkey, meaning that his mind was in such spiritual equilibrium that neither the *onus* on the one side nor the *honos* on the other disturbed his equanimity.[28] At every stage of the proceedings Pole displayed what on a lower level we must call the high breeding of an English gentleman. He was unfailingly calm, courteous, reserved, apparently indifferent, always good humored. He could not bring himself to bargain for votes though he knew that a single promise of promotion or a hint of reward would have made him pope.

Humanly speaking, it was just one of the many failures of his life. To Beccatelli it seemed that the Providence of God was reserving Pole for his work in England. It is, however, interesting to speculate what Pole might have done for Christian Unity had he become pope. He would have saved Europe from the

[27] Brown, V, 595.

[28] Quirini: IV, 56-59.

scandal of the war between Paul IV and the emperor. He would have hastened the work of legitimate reform. He might have saved Queen Mary from the fatal marriage with a Spaniard, and doubtless the bulk of Englishmen in 1553 would not unreadily have accepted the spiritual supremacy of an English pope.[29]

V

On July 5, 1553, Edward VI died. Mary entered London August 3. Ten days later the news penetrated the cloistered silence of Maguzzano, where Pole was living in retirement. He at once penned a letter that reads like an exuberant *Benedictus*. Then he wrote more calmly to the queen: "I hope that by the grace of Almighty God your Majesty may understand that only in obedience to the Church will the true interests of your realm find a basis of stability." Again towards the end of August he wrote to Mary and to Gardiner that their first step should be to restore England to unity with the center of Christendom. This he says should be done by parliamentary and constitutional means rather than by foreign alliances.

On September 25, 1553, Mary wrote to Pole in Latin: "I shall do my very best to heed your counsels, for I never was, nor am nor, by the grace of God, ever shall be opposed to your Catholic exhortation." Her next letter of October 28, was more formal and hesitating. The explanation, of course, is that the imperial ambassador had managed to become her prime minister. Pole warned her not to be led by the emperor, but it was in vain. Even in Rome the agents of Charles had the ear of the pope, and so Pole was deliberately kept out of England. When at last he was allowed to return he received a popular ovation which happily has been described at length by an Italian eyewitness, who has preserved for us in the vernacular the untranslatable "God keep you! God keep you!"[30] The astute French agent Nocailles had already written: "Pole is desired more than I could believe possible both by Catholics and Protestants", and the Venetian agent reported that Pole's arrival was "omnibus jucundissimus."

[29] Quirini: IV, 115.

[30] Quirini: V, 344.

On November 28, 1554, Pole explained his mission to Parliament: "I am come not to destroy but to build. . . . My commission is of grace and clemency to such as will receive it. . . . But you cannot receive the benefit and grace offered you by the Apostolic See until the abrogation of such laws by which you have disjoined and dissevered yourselves from the unity of Christ's Church." Two days later Pole experienced the supreme consolation of his life. He solemnly absolved the nation from all censures and restored England once more to life within the larger Church. It was the happiest day of his life. For all practical purposes it was his last. For although for four years more his life was the history of England, he was merely writing in sand. This last act in the tragedy of his life reads to us now like a sustained passage of dramatic irony.

It was part of that tragedy which Pole who had done so much for the pope, should fall under a shadow at Rome. He had sincerely but undiplomatically urged Paul IV to refrain from war. He was told that at Rome they suspected him of heresy. It nearly broke his heart. What a joke it would be among the gospellers in London, he wrote, to think that it took a heretic to bring back England to the fold! Then the old man roused himself and wrote a strong protest to the pope.[31]

On March 22, 1555, the day after Cranmer's death, Pole became Archbishop of Canterbury. He had worked ceaselessly for Cranmer's conversion. To Philip Pole wrote in regard to Cranmer: "He did not seem so obdurate and asked to speak with me. If he could only be brought to repentance the salvation of that one soul would be a great gain for the Church".[32] However, Pole failed to fix that wavering will which after six recantations at last refused to be reconciled.

Thus the way of Pole's life was strewn with failures. Not unreasonably Dr. Gairdner asks the question: "Was Pole impractical?"[33] He answers himself: "Pole might be impractical, but he was right in principle." Nevertheless, Pole's handling of

[31] Quirini: V, 64.
[32] Quirini: V, Ep. xx.
[33] *Lollardy and Reformation*, IV, 152.

the practical problems in regard to the possession of Church property is remarkable. He started from the principle, which in a letter to the pope he expressed with almost cynical frankness, that the new nobility and gentry of England were ready for any submission in doctrine which involved no loss of lands. The problem was not one of reunion but of revenue. He assured the queen that spiritual supremacy would mean no temporal yoke. His agent in Rome, Ormaneto, in fact, helped to effect a condescension to accomplished facts almost unparalleled in the history of the papal chancery. The argument was urged that since Church property may be alienated for the redemption of slaves, *a fortiori,* an accomplished alienation may be accepted in the interest of the redemption of a whole nation from disunion. Hence in open Parliament Pole declared: "All persons to whom a sufficient conveyance according to the common law of the land has been made of the said lands and possessions may without any scruple of conscience enjoy them, and they shall suffer no molestation on pretence of decrees of general councils or of the canon law and they shall be clear of any danger of the Church's censures."

Pole died on November 17, 1558. The permanent interest of his life lies rather in his principles and his personality than in any lasting historical achievement. He was earnest without solemnity, a scholar without pedantry, and zealous for the truth without intolerance of sincere dissent. In an age of profound moral, intellectual, and political perplexities he guided himself and tried to guide others with rare spiritual and psychological discernment, maintaining the supremacy of dogmatic orthodoxy without a loss of spiritual freedom and calmly accepting at whatever cost their logical implications in conduct. On the stage of European history he played a part as the last genuine incarnation of the spirit of Holy Roman imperialism. He stood, that is to say, for the idea that the solidarity and stability of Europe could only be maintained by the fearless application of the principles of Christianity both to national politics and to the problems of international relations. Such political idealism in the sixteenth century was doomed to fail, and failed. But if to the historians of yesterday Pole seemed to be clinging to an ob-

solescent medievalism, many today are reminding us that the way to peace, if not to progress, is to be found in a new re-discovery of the past.

In the history of the Church, Pole's name is honorably and inseperably associated with the Council of Trent and the Counter-Reformation. His greatest literary and political work was in defense of the unity of the Church. He failed. Yet if properly appraised, his philosophy of ecclesiastical statesmanship gives a permanence of value to his struggle for ideals that is not to be measured by the failure of his life.

GERALD GROVELAND WALSH.

MISCELLANY

AN UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENT ON THE GREAT INTERDICT (1207-1213).

A Clairvaux Ms., now 862 of the Library of Troyes, contains:

(1) The *Verbum Abbreviatum* [1] of Petrus Cantor, ff. 1-74^{v}.

(2) Thirty-two sermons, twenty-nine of which are anonymous, ff. 75^{r}-131^{v}.

(3) A *Liber Scintillarum,*[2] a series of *auctoritates* drawn from the Fathers and from Seneca.

The Ms. contains 146 ff. (0,225 x 0,310), written on double columns by a single scribe. The writing seems to belong to the latter half of the thirteenth century.

We are interested in the group of sermons, three of which are attributed by the rubricator to Master Stephen Langton. They begin:

(a) *In Deo speravit cor meum . . . Audivimus, fratres,* f. 85^{r}.

(b) *Iustum deduxit Dominus . . . Vellem ad vos venire frequentius,* f. 90^{v}.

(c) *Cum venisset Saul ad civitatem Amalech . . . Notat causam cum,* f. 121v°.

Whether the other twenty-nine sermons in the collection are from Langton's pen is still a matter of speculation. Some 500 of the Cardinal's sermons have come down to us; further research is continually augmenting the number; still we have no second copy of the sermons contained in this Ms., even of the three specifically attributed to Langton; they are unique.

The sermon on St. Martin: *Iustum deduxit,* and that on the Passion: *Cum venisset Saul,* are of slight importance, but the *Sermo Magistri Stephani Archiepiscopi ad populum* is an historical document of considerable value. It is the sermon preached by the Cardinal on the 25th of August (1213) at London shortly after he had absolved King John from excommunication at Winchester.

[1] *P. L.*, t. CCV.

[2] Other copies of this work (all anonymous) whose *incipit* is: *Deo omnipotentis Filius inter cetera,* are to be found in the following Mss.: Beaune 28 (29); Bordeaux 287; Paris, Arsenal, 266; Rouen A. 526 (677).

To set this document[3] in its historical background it suffices to recall the disputed election to the See of Canterbury after the death of Hubert Walter. Both pretendents, one of them the nominee of the king, appealed to Innocent III; but the pope quashed both elections and named to the metropolitan See one of the greatest theologians of his time, Master Stephen Langton, whom he had raised to the purple in 1206, under the title of St. Chrysogonus, and whom he consecrated at Viterbo on the 17th of June, 1207. King John answered by forbidding Langton to enter the Kingdom, exiling the Archbishop's supporters, and confiscating church property. Innocent III retaliated by the excommunication of the king, and finally in January, 1213, by a sentence of deposition. Whereupon John, face to face with the fear of "desertion by his own barons, the danger from Philip, the general anxiety caused by the excommunication, the irksome interdict, the flights to France, the prophecies of the enthusiast, Peter of Wakefield",[4] decided to capitulate, promising amnesty and restitution. Langton returned to England; with other prelates he met the king at Winchester (July 20, 1213) and absolved him from excommunication at the door of the church. From Winchester the Archbishop proceeded to St. Albans, thence to London, where a great assembly of clergy and barons gathered at St. Paul's on August 25.

After much eloquence from the other magnates, Langton preached to the populace on the text: *In Deo speravit cor meum.* At some point in the sermon—the text serves for the *prothema* as well as the *thema*—the *Annales Monastici*[5] tell us there came a dramatic interruption. From the crowd rose a voice: "Thou liest; thy heart never trusted in God, and thy flesh never rejoiced." The sermon we give here is a copy of Langton's discourse on this occasion. It gives some ground for believing in this interruption: *Obicit michi aliquis forsitan dicens: Domine archiepiscope et vos episcopi, vos speratis in Deo et adiuti estis, nos speravimus in Deo, nec sumus adiuti. Quare in Angliam venistis et silet Ecclesia, quare accessistis et ostia non aperuistis Ecclesie? Maledicitis et de nobis malum dicitis* (f. 88r). It is true that Langton speaks merely of a possible objection, nor is it the one mentioned by the *Annales Monastici.*[6] Let us assume, how-

[3] Cf. F. M. Powicke: *Stephen Langton*, Oxford, 1928. Professor Powicke also knew the existence of this sermon, but did not have the opportunity to consult it. (*Op. cit.*, p. 42.)

[4] Powicke, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[5] *Annales Monastici*, ed. Luard., t. II, p. 277 (Rolls Series).

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 277. "Archiepiscopus cito post adventum eius in Angliam.

ever, an interruption by some drunken individual in the great concourse at St. Paul's. It is very doubtful if Langton could have distinguished it sufficiently to take it under consideration. It would be safe to hold that the Cardinal knew the undercurrent of public opinion, more or less openly expressed, and took occasion to justify his own attitude. For the same reason it seems preferable to regard the form of the interruption recorded in the *Annales* as a literary artifice by one who knew of the event but not the actual words.

At any rate there can be no doubt of the authenticity of this sermon, of the skill with which it is put together according to the rules of the *Artes Predicandi,* nor of the blunt honesty of the English Cardinal talking to his fellow countrymen a language they could not misunderstand, however little they might appreciate it. Their misfortunes are their own fault; they have put their trust in creatures, they have given way to the national vices of gluttony and drunkenness. There is not a word of personal triumph in the whole sermon. It shows us the Langton pictured by Professor Powicke: the statesman who rules by principle, whose public actions square with the political theory he taught at Paris. Langton is not interested in the return of the confiscated property as such, but in the respect due a principle: *Restitutio ablatorum.*

One passage in the sermon, however, needs interpretation: *Nec aliquis nostrum curiam Romanam adiit, cum illud impetraretur capitulum, scilicet ut non relaxeretur interdictum donec restituerentur ablata, immo dominus rex illud postulavit et per nuntios suos impetravit* (f. 88^{v}). There is something astonishing about this zeal for restitution manifested by the unscrupulous John. The phrase, however, will probably be clear to specialists on the period.

It will be noted that the text has come down to us in excellent shape, only a few minor corrections have been deemed necessary.

primum concilium ex viris ecclesiasticis apud Westmonasterium in crastino Sancti Bartholomaei convocavit; sed in primis apud Sanctum Paulum sermonem fecit ad populum; quo sic incepto: *In Deo speravit cor meum et adiutus sum et refloruit caro mea,* etc., surgens quidam verbis huiuscemodi alta voce respondit: 'Per mortem Dei, inquit, mentiris, nunquam cor tuum speravit in Deo nec refloruit caro tua'. Hoc audito tacuit archipraesul, obstupescentibus omnibus; nec mora, irruente in eum populo, flagellatus est, custodiaeque traditus, ut in die sequenti qua temeritate huiuscemodi proferret sermonem innotesceret. Archipraesul vero prosecutus est sermonem . . ."

Ms. Troyes, 862, fol. 85b.

Sermo magistri Stephani archiepiscopi Cantuariensis ad populum:

In Deo speravit cor meum et adiutus sum, et refloruit caro mea, et ex voluntate mea confitebor illi.[1] Audivimus fratres karissimi, et bene scimus quod optimis plena est civitas ista doctoribus, qui vobis sepe verba vite disseminant, et doctrina erudiunt salutari. Vos autem eorum doctrina tanquam delicatis cibis enutriti, sermonem nostrum tanquam insipidum timemus vobis proponere, post tantorum virorum dulcedinem, qui nobis vita et scientia meliores existunt. Sepe tamen solet contingere ut qui multas et diu sumpserunt delicias, cibos postmodum appetant grossiores et qui vini refecti sunt deliciosa dulcedine, aquam affectant insipidam degustare. Et quia ex Deo est sermo predicantis, qualiscumque sit ille qui predicat, credimus quod verbum nostrum auribus et cordibus vestris placebit. Sed cum in omni opere debeat oratio precedere, ut opus inceptum ad effectum ducatur, orare debetis ut Dominus noster sermonem nostrum, qui suus est, ad vestrarum salutem dirigat animarum. Orate itaque. Sed quomodo? ut Apostolus Colosensibus scribens ait: *Orationi instate, orantes pro nobis, ut Deus aperiat nobis ostium sermonis ad loquendum misterium Christi.*[2] Hoc ostium ad nos pertinet et ad vos. Ostium nostrum est os nostrum, de quo egredi debet sermo Domini; ostium autem vestrum quo ingredi debet, sunt aures vestre; aures vestre similes debent esse cribro quod farine medullam pertransire sinit et farinam grossam reicit et excludit, verba vite que vos instruant et informent recipere debetis ut per aures vestras ad cor vestrum pertranseant, illa vero que peccata suggerunt tanquam farinam grossam respuere et omnino vitare.

In Deo speravit cor meum etc. Verbum istud legitur in persona capitis sed potest legi in persona membrorum. Quatuor autem partes in sermone proposito sunt distincte quas Spiritus Sanctus per os David proposuit et distinxit. Prima particula est: *In Deo speravit cor meum;* optimum principium quod a spe incipit; de ipsa ergo loquamur. Sed quia due sunt species vel spes duplex, una bona, altera mala, una mundi, altera Dei, de spe mundi primo dicamus ipsam in medio proponentes. Spes mundana fallax est et deceptrix, que quia talis est, ideo sic eam describit Ecclesiasticus dicens: *Ingrati spes tanquam glacies hyemalis, que cito tabescit, et quasi aqua supervacua.*[3] Ingratus est qui Deo de bonis prestitis non agit gratias, qui plus de mundo confidit quam de Deo. Ideo ingrati spes glaciei hyemali comparatur; melius autem videretur dixisse, si inter glaciem Aprilis et spem ingrati fieret comparatio, quia cum fragilis sit glacies Aprilis et fragilis appareat, et glacies hyemalis fortis videatur et non sit sed fortis putatur esse, melius glaciei Aprilis videretur spem ingrati quam

[1] Ps. xxvii, 7. [2] Col. iv, 3. [3] N. B. Sap., xvi, 29.

glaciei hyemali comparasse, quia una fragilis videtur esse et est, altera fortis videtur esse et non est. Sed hec est ratio quare potius glaciei hyemali quam glaciei Aprilis spem mundi comparavit, quia spes mundi videtur esse fortissima et iccirco in illa confidunt quamplurimi, quos decipit et absorbet alliciens eos fortitudine sua sed fragilitate occulta decipiens. Dicit ergo quod spes ingrati est quasi glacies hyemalis quia spes mundi fortitudine sua, que fallax est, ad se trahit innumeros, et ita fere fallit singulos que cito tabescit quia tabescens est in se et alios tabescere facit.

Comparatur eadem aque supervacue. Scitis quod aqua fluvii leviter currit et leniter, et ideo cursus non deficit sic currentis, aqua autem inundans et superhabundans impetu proprio se ipsam consumit et confundit, quia fluctus a fluctu tonditur, et sic per se minoratur immo adnichilatur. Recte ergo aque supervacue spes ingrati comparatur quia spes mundi sperans sublima per se in nichilum redigitur et in se confidentes ad nichilum redigit. Spes ista que sit in Libro Sapientie verbis aliis demonstratur ubi dicitur: *Spes impii tanquam spuma aque a procella deicitur et quasi fumus qui a vento dispergitur, et tanquam memoria hospitis unius noctis qui pertransit.*[4] Tria hic proponuntur scilicet spuma, fumus, et memoria hospitis. Spes que primo dicebatur ingrati, dicitur hic spes impii. Scitis quod spuma natans de facili dispergitur, sic spes impii de facili dissolvitur motibus fortune variis, et malicia temporis. Spuma vero non fit de fluctu nisi cum aqua labitur in profundum et spes impii terrena sapiens spuma efficitur dum infimis intendit et terrenis tanquam spuma cadens in profunda.

Spes ista fumo comparatur, quia fumus oculos excecat hominis, ne videat quid illi expediat. Multi hoc fumo excecantur; unde dominus rex eodem fumo cecus effectus, aliquantulum iam, Deo volente, visum oculorum recipit, qua ligabatur sententia absolutus, et Ecclesie se satisfacturum promittens. Fumus etiam quanto magis ascendit tanto citius dissolvitur, sic spes in mundum confidentis, quanto magis elevatur tanto citius dissipatur. Fumus multorum iam ascendit quia spes eorum pervenit ad altiora, et ideo timere debet unusquisque ne fumus suus cito dissolvatur. Reducere debent reges et principes ad memoriam et dicere intra se: Fumus noster in altum ascendit quia per spem mundanam prorsus elevamur, fieri non potest quod duret diutius. Hec cogitet unusquisque, et actus pravos corrigat et emendet ne fumus ascendens eos amplius non excecet, et de casu suo sibi prospiciant.

Comparatur iterum spes impii memorie hospitis unius noctis qui pertransit. Scitis quod apud quos homines hospitantur, brevis est memoria hospitis unius noctis. Et quid si dixisset Scriptura: Tanquam memoria hospitis unius diei? certe utriusque memoria transit de facili tamen per hoc quod ait unius noctis, voluit exprimere quod malorum memoria qui

[4] Sap., v, 15.

per noctem designantur, citius cadens evanescit. Noctem enim malos, bonos autem diem vocat Sacra Scriptura. Nostis quod hospitans cum hospite computat in recessu; hospitans est mundus, hospes est homo; certe districtius computat mundus cum homine cum discedit quam hospes cum homine cum recedit, quia hospitans de proprietate hospitis nichil retinere presumit, sed mundus homini recedenti cum moritur nil relinquit nisi tantum trium denariorum sudarium, et per hoc ostendit ea que retinet hospitis non fuisse sed hospitantis, quia si sua fuissent eadem secum asportaret. Istud melius docebimus per exemplum. Sint hic duo homines colloquentes, assit canis veniens cum altero eorum; dum loquuntur utrumque respicit indifferenter, non plus uni intendit quam alteri, sed cum recedit ductor ipsius, ducem sequitur cum quo venit. A simili cum quis moritur in hoc seculo parum sibi retinens, mundo relinquit universa, et per hoc ostenditur ea mundi fuisse quia ad mundum redeunt, et cum mundo remanent cuius fuerunt et cum quo venerunt. Recte ergo impii spes comparatur memorie hospitis unius noctis qui pertransit, quia de facili labitur de corde hospitantis. Sic homo cum moritur, cito mundus eundem obliviscitur, quia quantumlibet homo vivat, *mille anni ante oculos tuos tanquam dies hesterna que preteriit*,[5] *et tanquam memoria hospitis unius noctis qui pertransit*.[6] Talis est spes impii, talis et ingrati.

Scitis quod homines brevis stature cum altum cupiunt ascendere vel aliquid altius intendunt apprehendere, scabellum supponunt pedibus suis, ut facilius altiora contingant. Nos autem spem talem, spem mundi, et ipsum mundum, pedibus nostris debemus supponere et terrena conculcare, ut illa pedum nostrorum sint scabellum et sic contingere possimus ad gaudia paradisi. Divitie nostre nos conculcant, sed religiosi ipsas calcant divitias, mundum habentes pro scabello. Qui divitiis se supponunt similes sunt illis qui vulgaliter *guaegnepain* nuncupantur qui ob parvum precium tantam sarcinam suis imponunt humeris quod per pondus deprimuntur, hii sunt illi qui secularibus serviunt divitiis, suppositi ipsis, cum potius eis superponi deberent. Quod vituperat ethnicus dicens: Et michi res, non me rebus subiungere conor. Sarcinas innumeras peccatorum gerunt Anglicani, sed duabus proprie specialiter deprimuntur quibus descendunt ad infima, hee sunt ingluvies et ebrietas. Hec duo vicia maxime regnant in Anglia, et est Anglorum proprietas bibere ad *verseil*.[7] Contra tales

[5] Ps. lxxxix, 4.

[6] Sap., v, 15.

[7] In his gloss on the Epistles of St. Paul (Paris, Bibl. nat., ms. lat., 14443 f. 317b) Langton says: "Dixit etiam quidam Anglicus quod magis exhilaratur animus si diceretur ei semel Gwesseyl, quam si cencies diceretur ei. Esto hilaris." Cf. likewise the *Constitutiones Domini de Langton, edite apud Lameth*, in the Ms. 538, f. 103 of Lambeth Palace, London: "Prohibitionem scotalliarum seu scotallarum, scilicet: Laye for thy scott as y for myn,

dicit Ysaias: *Ve qui potentes estis ad bibendum vinum et potandum usque ad vesperam ut vino estuetis, cythara et lyra et tympanum in conviviis vestris, et opus Domini non respicitis nec opera manuum eius consideratis.*[8] Vereor quod de vobis dici possit quod sitis potentes ad bibendum vinum etc. Opus Domini sunt pauperes, quibus quod habetis tenemini erogare, istos non respicitis, nec opera manuum suarum consideratis, quomodo manus suas pro nobis habuit cruci confixas? Potatores enim inter pocula, plagas Domini non reducunt ad memoriam nec passionis Christi faciunt mentionem. Hec duo, gula et ebrietas, in nobis Anglicis principantur, sed ut illa recedant de cetero exemplum proponemus ipsa fugiendi. Audistis quod quedam infirmitates iure hereditario transfunduntur in posteros et a patribus in filios derivantur ut est pedum egritudo. Si autem pater alicuius tali morbo laboraret et eodem cogente moreretur, nonne filius eius morbum illum formidaret et modis omnibus precaveret ne in hereditariam caderet egritudinem? Fallor si non sibi peccaveret: Pater noster, scilicit Adam, per gulam eiectus est de paradiso, sed morbum quo pater cecidit filii non formidant. Cur morbum patris quo mortuus est non cavemus? Quare per ingluviem nitimur cadere per quam patrem nostrum scimus cecidisse? Similes nos facimus traditoribus; in regnis aliis et regionibus traditores dominis suis per colla se tradunt, sic et nos Anglici domino nostro per gulas nostras nos tradimus ad similitudinem traditorum qui laqueos collis suis circumducunt, et ita domini sui se subicientes iudicio, dignos se iudicant supplicio traditorum. Ebrietas est vinculum quo ligamur, ingluvies est vicium pro quo pro proditoribus reputamur. Debemus ergo ebrietatem refrenare per abstinentiam, ingluviem per ieiunium, et sic istis mediantibus divitias mundanas habere pro scabello.

Qualiter vero divites scabellum faciant de divitiis docet Paulus scribens ad Timotheum in fine: *Divitibus precipe non sublime sapere neque sperare in incerto divitiarum . . . facile tribuere, communicare, thesaurizare, fundamentum per quod ascendant ad veram vitam.*[9] Nota quod dixit: *Precipe;* singula enim notanda sunt, primo dicit: *precipe,* quia precipere possumus, non cogere; *precipe,* inquit, *non sublime sapere,* hoc est non superbire pro possessionibus vel divitiis, aut pompa seculari. Et quare? Quia divites superbientes similes sun pueris qui sufflant in vesicam et

---

et aliarum potationem pro salute animarum et corporum, introductam, providenda approbatione prosequentes, rectoribus, vicariis, et aliis capellanis parochialibus precipimus, sub obedientie debito, firmiter iniungendo quia parochianis suis crebra exhortacione diligenter indicant, ne prohibitionis huiusmodi violatores temerarii existant." Other copies of these Constitutions are the Mss. 6 g.6-21, f. 27, and Ii-III-14, f. 386, of the University Library, Cambridge.

[8] Isaias, v, ii. [9] I Tim., vi, 17.

in ea lapillum vel fabam imponunt, vesicam rotant et sonum faciunt, vesica est pompa secularis que cum fastu graditur et incedit pompose et tumultuose se gerit. Si vero vesicam vento inflatam pungat acus minima, ventus egreditur et sonus moritur cum tumultu. Sic cum ad pomposum ingreditur egritudo, et suo eum pungit acumine, ut est frebris [*sic*] acuta, anima sine mora egreditur et pompa recedit. Sed quare [*febrine*] acutam assimilavi puncto acus aut punctioni? Quia maior infirmitas que contingit, minor est in respectu tormentorum gehenne, vel penarum quas patientur pomposi. Tormenta enim exquisita et excogitata in hoc seculo, quantum ad gehenne cruciatus minima reputantur, sicut minor gutta maris minus habet amaritudinis quam generalis maris magnitudo que mundum circumfluit universum. Audistis quod dicitur in proverbio. Cum emptori displicet res emenda emptor dicit venditori: "Vos venditis michi vesicam pro lanterna." Iste mercator vel venditor est mundus, qui intendit vendere vesicam pro lanterna, id est superbiam mundanam pro gloria paradisi, que lanterne vel lucerne comparatur, quia lumen habet indeficiens. De hiis qui prosperitatem mundanam querunt et superbiam ait Iob: *Super eum lucerna eius extinguetur,*[10] per lucernam prosperitatem significans.

Sequitur: *Neque sperare in incerto divitiarum;* incertum est quicquid est transitorium, certum est quicquid est eternum. Per hoc quod precipit non sperare in incerto diviciarum suadet sperare in eius contrario, scilicet certo. Precipit ergo et nos precipimus non sperare in incerto diviciarum quod est falsitas, sed sperare in certo divitiarum, id est, in certis divitiis et eternis que sunt veritas.

Sequitur: *Facile tribuere* quia de facili pauperibus tribuendum est. *Precipe, communicare,* id est sua communia facere et non propria reputare; hoc enim communicare. Hinc ait sapiens filium suum instruens et informans: Si multum habes, de facili tribue, si parum, libenter impartiri stude. Tria verba proposuit: libenter, impartiri, stude. *Libenter* dicit ut voluntarie tribuas, et ex mera liberalitate; *impartiri* ut non uni sed pluribus et in plures partes dividatur; *stude,* ut ex studio fiat et discrete.

Sequitur: *Precipe thesaurizare fundamentum,* etc. Scitis, qui in hac civitate edificatis, qualiter debeat poni domus fundamentum. Fundamentum fieri debet non tantum ex minimis, sed ex magnis lapidibus et impolitis. Fundamentum domus, id est vita eterna, fieri debet de collata nobis substancia et hoc est ex lapidibus; lapides isti sunt bona que pauperibus erogamus, qui magni esse debent quia parum meretur qui de magna facultate parum largitur. Non enim sufficit de centum marchis dare pauperi pittavinam[11] aut unum sterlingonem. Lapides isti debent

[10] Job, xxiv, 20.

[11] This *pittavina,* or *pictavina,* was the denier or penny of Poitou. Ducange does not give the form *sterlingo.* This seems another form of *sterlingus.*

esse impoliti et sicut cadunt de quarrario, quia ob laudem humanam vel favorem non debet christianus suam substantiam erogare. Non tamen dico quod vicino tuo non des exemplum tribuendi, sed non ob hominum facias favorem aut laudem, nec gloriam unde speres humanam, quia hec est spes impii de qua dicitur quod spes impii est tanquam spuma que a procella deicitur. Hec spes a vobis discedat et ab ecclesia Anglicana quam quia a vobis optamus discedere amplius de ea loqui nec volumus nec debemus.

Sed de spe dissimili tanquam meliori iam loqui volumus de que dicitur: *In Deo speravit cor meum* etc. Hec est spes hominis iusti sperantis in Deum et supernis inhiantis. Hanc spem boni amplectuntur et ea nittuntur ad celestia. De hac spe dicit Ysaias: *Sancti qui sperant in Domino mutabunt fortitudinem.* Verbum sane intelligendum est scilicet *mutabunt fortitudinem,*[12] quia qui prius Deo non servierunt, postmodum Deo servire proponunt. Et vos similiter mutare debetis fortitudinem. Si fortes fuistis ad ingluviem, mutate fortitudinem ut fortes sitis ad ieiunium; si fortes fuistis ad ebrietatem sectandam, fortes sitis ad sobrietatem imitandam; si fortes fuistis ad luxuriam, fortes sitis ad continentiam. Dico enim quod omnis coitus preter coitum coniugalem mortalis est et trahit ad infernum. Nolo vobis verbum masticare, sed crude dicere. Si sic mutatis fortitudinem certe in Domino speratis et *In Domino speravit cor meum.* Existens Parisius[13] sepe proposui quoddam verbum Apostoli vobis proponere: dicit enim ad Philippenses in fine: *Modestia vestra nota sit omnibus hominibus.*[14] Immoderantia, gule, et ebrietas Anglicana nota est hominibus omnibus; sed sicut iam nota est omnibus vestra immoderantia, vellem quod nota esset eis vestra modestia, ut immoderantia vestra et non modus in modum transiret et moderantiam, et sic mutetis fortitudinem. Si cuiquam vestrum obiceretur an aliquo modo fieret inimicus crucis Christi, quod nullo modo fieret responderet. Discite ergo quomodo Apostolus dicit ebrietati subditos et gule crucis Christi esse inimicos. Ait enim ad Philippenses: *Dico inimicos crucis Christi quorum deus venter est.*[15] Ergo gulosi facti sunt crucis Christi inimici, quia castrum quod hostis erexit instaurant, scilicet ingluviem, et castrum fortiter presumunt impugnare quod Christus erexit scilicet abstinentiam.

From the text it should be synonymous with *pictavina*. Cf. also the text quoted by Ducange: "Trigenta marcas bonorum, novorum, et legalium sterlingorum, scilicet xiii solidis et quatuor sterlingis pro marca qualibet computandis."

[12] Isaias, xl, 31.

[13] This seems to indicate a longer sojourn at Paris, during Langton's exile, than has ordinarily been supposed. It can hardly be imagined that a simple master would so address his countrymen tho it is conceivable in the case of a medieval primate.

[14] Philip. iv, 5.

[15] Philip., iii, 19.

Sequitur: *Et adiutus sum.* Hoc ait cuius cor in Domino speravit Ecce qualiter spem sequitur adiutorium; Deus enim adiutor est sperantium in se. Speretis ergo in eum et ipsum habebitis adiutorem. Deus adiutor est sed non secundum hominis voluntatem. Ideo determinat David qualiter sit adiutor. Adiutor, inquit, *in oportunitatibus, in tribulatione.*[16] Cum quis infirmatur vel cadit in miseriam, dicit: *Domine Deus adiuva me;* sed non statim exaudit sic penitentem, quia forsan egritudo vel miseria ei ad salutem anime proficiet et ideo dicitur: *Adiutor in oportunitatibus.* De hoc adiutore ait Elyud in Iob: *Adiutor secundum tempus oportunum;* et consonat verbo proposito quod ait David: *Adiutor in oportunitatibus.* Iste est adiutor et amicus oportunus. Tres enim sunt amici, quorum duo falsi sunt et fallaces, tercius verax et fidelis. Duo fallunt amicum suum fraudulenter, sed tercius, scilicet fidelis, nec amicum vult decipere nec ab eius amicicia separari. Primus est amicus mense, scilicet venter quem in mensa socium habemus nec deficit in convivio. Secundus amicus est mundus fallax et infidelis qui a te non recedit cum accedit prosperitas, sed cum prosperitas evanescit fugit et deserit in se confidentem. Tercius amicus fidelis est et adiutor in oportunitatibus, Deus scilicet qui sperantem in se in nullo deserit articulo. Scitis quod cum inter duos vicinos fit discordia, ad concordiam reformandam amici eorum convocantur, sed fallaces amicum suum deserunt, fidelis vero cuius est nota fidelitas, nunquam recedit ab amico, immo eidem assistit adiutor oportunus. Cum venter et mundus nos relinquunt, Deus nobis semper astat. Iste est amicus de quo dicit illud gallicum proverbium, *quod melius valet amicus in via quam nummus in corrigia.* Iste est amicus fidelis de quo dicit Ecclesiasticus, quid fideli amico nulla est comparatio. Ideo dicit David: *Adiutor in oportunitatibus in tribulatione.*

Obicit michi aliquis forsitan dicens: "Domine archiepiscope, et vos episcopi, vos speratis in Deo et adiuti estis, nos speravimus in Deo nec sumus adiuti. Quare in Angliam venistis, et silet Ecclesia, quare accessistis et ostia non aperuistis Ecclesie? Maledicitis nobis et de nobis malum dicitis." Respondeo quod taliter agentes peccatis mortaliter. Vos enim cum sitis laici, vestros prelatos tales esse debetis credere ut omnia discrete agant et cum consilio. Dominus papa Christianitatis dominus est et eidem oportet obedire. Quod autem indiscrete loquimini, melius videbitis per exemplum; si mater alicuius gravi febre laboraret et per medicos febris accessus recederet, sustineret filius eius ut carnem bovis grossam aut aucam crassam statim comederet? Sustineretne ut in choreis saltare iret? Non credo quod sustineret. Ecclesia sancta mater nostra est; ipsa diu et iam per. vi. annos gravi, immo gravissima febre laboravit, quia eam fortitudo malorum depressit. Iam aliquantulum, ab accessu febris liberata respiravit, vultis ut recidivet? Non est ei utile ut statim post accessus sui libera-

[16] Ps., ix, 10.

tionem saltet et choros circunducat. Delicate ad pristinam et tanquam quibusdam gradibus reducenda est sanitatem ut integra sit fortitudo. Integra non erit nisi ei restauretur quod per malos est ablatum. Tot mala sunt ei illata et tot bona ablata quod de facili non potest saltare vel cantare pre dolore quem contraxit ex ablatione tum bonorum suorum tum libertatum. Raptores eam bonis suis spoliaverunt; nisi ablata restituantur et sic resurgat, ad eam iterum impugnandam promptior inimicus reddetur [*ac*] si gaudeat de rapina. Iam in parte respiravit quia dominus rex bono consilio usus, matri nostre iuste faciet restitui quod iniuste ablatum fuit eidem et extortum. Et tunc cantabit mater nostra cum plene fuerit liberata.

Sciatis autem universi quod si totus mundus in auream massam vel in smaragdum converteretur aut rubeum et michi offerretur ut interdicti sententia solveretur, videre non possum articulum, qualiter possit ad honorem Ecclesie relaxari, nisi prius omnibus restitutis que sibi dolet fuisse ablata. Nec aliquis nostrum curiam Romanam adiit cum illud impetraretur capitulum scilicet ut non relaxaretur interdictum donec restituerentur ablata, immo dominus rex illud postulavit et per nuntios suos impetravit. Ideo non possumus nec debemus ipsum interdictum aliter relaxare, nec vos super hoc nos vituperare debetis vel nobis detrahere, immo pro nobis orare et nos diligere, cum potius ad honorem matris vestre illud faciamus quam ob aliquam cupiditatem. Nolumus enim ut iterum malorum insultus invadat Ecclesiam, si peccatum eorum maneat impunitum.

Scitis quod Ecclesia non potest per se salva consistere nisi habeat defensorem. Iccirco reges et principes constituit Ecclesia tanquam sua brachia. Brachiis se defendit cum eam infestat impetus inimici. Brachium Ecclesie Anglicane, quod est dominus rex, infirmum fuit et confractum, dum per malorum consilium illam impugnavit, quam defendere tenebatur. Iam in parte sanum effectum est quia iam absolutus cepit Eccesiam adiuvare. Cum alicuius brachium confractum est et accedit aliqua spes sanitatis, non statim huc illuc torqueri potest vel curvari; prius enim ligaturas amovere oportet et unguentis fovere ut sic, pristina sanitate recepta, suum vigorem recipiat et virtutem. A simili dominus rex, qui primo Ecclesie apparuit iracundus, iam apparet mitis et mansuetus et sic paulatim suam duriciam emollivit, sicque brachium Ecclesie aliquantulum sanitatem recepit. Cum autem integre totum sanum fuerit ut Ecclesie faciat ablata restitui tunc defendet matrem suam et ipsa pre gaudio filii ipsam protegentis in vocem exultationis erumpet, cantabit et chorum ducet, ab adiutore oportuno habens auxilium in quo speravit cor suum.

Sequitur: *et refloruit caro mea.* Verbum pulcherrimum quod de flore mentionem facit. Ecce qualiter sperantes per adiutorem oportunum iuvantur ut eorum caro refloreat. Hoc verbum *refloruit* innuit quod qui

marcidi erant reflorere possunt. Floruit caro nostra per baptismum, sed quia lapsi sumus, refloreat per penitentiam. Marcidi sumus, immo putridi, viciis, sed si peniteamus, possumus reflorere. Sic ergo quilibet peniteat ut refloreat. Sed quomodo potest homo reflorere? Dicit Apostolus ad Philippenses: *Refloruistis pro me sentire sicut et sentiebatis.*[17] Gratias agit suis benefactoribus. Refloreamus ergo qui marcidi hactenus fueramus; refloreat caro nostra per humilitatem que per superbiam fuerat putrefacta. Refloreat per penitentiam que fetebat per multiformem maliciam; refloreat caro nostra per amorem continentie que marcida fuit per fetorem luxurie; refloreat unusquisque per contemptum mundi qui marcidus erat per contemptum Dei. Dicit aliquis: Quis fructus sequitur si caro refloreat? Si florem cernitis in arbore spes fructus ex flore concipitur. Fructus autem floris eorum qui reflorent est ille de quo Iohannes in Apocalipsi ait: *Beati mortui qui in Domino moriuntur; opera enim illorum secuntur illos.*[18] Flos enim bonus fructum bonum generat et producit quia illi[s] qui reflorent per boni operis consummationem eterne vite datur immortalitas.

Quarta clausula restat exponenda qua dicitur: *Et ex voluntate mea confitebor illi.* Pulchre dixit. Est enim triplex confessio: confessio latronis, confessio lecatoris, confessio boni hominis. Confessio latronis potius est extorta quam voluntaria, tortor enim latronem afficit tot tormentis quod vi, non voluntate confitetur. Confessionem ergo hominis tarde sibi providentis et sero penitentis confessionem latronis appellamus. Divitem enim egrotantem sua circumstat familia; assunt et amici ut sibi provideat rogantes, et sic eum cogit quodammodo confiteri importunitas amicorum. Uxor divitis lacrimatur, pueri plorant, et sic magis cogitat de sua coniuge vel pueris quam de suorum circumstanciis peccatorum; potius etiam cogitat de censu quem relinquit quam de confessione facienda. Iccirco confessionem talem confessioni latronis comparamus, quia sicut latro invitus confitetur, sic talis vi et coactione amicorum potius confitetur quam voluntate. Procul sit a nobis talis confessio sed illa a vobis non recedat de qua hic dicitur: *Et ex voluntate mea confitebor illi.* Confiteamur ergo illi ex voluntate quia Deo placet confessio voluntaria. Confessio lecatoris vel ribaudi est mundanam vituperare vanitatem et nichilominus se subicit vanitati. Parisius olim transiens per tabernam ribaudum ciphum tenentem et vino estuantem vidi, qui, me audiente, mundum vituperans ait: O quam pravus est mundus iste; mundum vituperavit sed tamen mundum non reliquit. Hec fuit confessio ribaudi, qui mente non abhoruit quod ore dampnavit. Procul sit a nobis ista confessio, per quam plures in infernum descenderunt, mundum malum confidentes sed mente eidem et operibus adherentes. Tercia confessio longe dissimilis est et

[17] Philip., iv, 10.

[18] Apoc., xiv, 1.

duabus premissis contraria. De hac dicitur: *Et ex voluntate mea confitebor illi.* Vir enim bonus ex voluntate confitetur, contra latronis confessionem, et devitat quod vituperat contra lecatoris confessionem, omnem diem supremum sibi constituens; semper de se ipso cogitat morituro, et ideo horam confessionis prevenit; sanus et incolumis integre et devote confitens. De hac confessione dicitur in Ecclesiastico: Vivens et sanus confiteberis. Integre confitetur per gradus peccata recolligens universa; devote confitetur eadem exterminans per devotionem mentis. Sic ergo, karissimi, sperate in Domino, ut ab ipso adiuti tendatis ad celestia, ut ex voluntate vestra postmodum confitentes tandem perveniatis ad gaudia paradisi. Quod nobis et vobis prestare dignetur . . . (Fol. 89^{b}).

GEORGE LACOMBE.

BOOK REVIEWS

Karl Marx's Interpretation of History. By MANDELL MORTON BOBER, PH. D. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1928. $3.50.)

The economic theory of history, at one time hailed as the key to the explanation of the deepest forces that shape all human development and direct the course of future events, has lost much of its erstwhile prestige. Only recently it has been abandoned by America's most prominent socialist. Though perhaps still a large number pin their faith to the ingenious construction, a steadily increasing majority is beginning to look upon it as a convenient fiction that helpfully summarizes facts rather than a philosophical interpretation of underlying causes. Withal it retains its value for socialistic agitation, in which it plays a part analogous to that of G. Sorel's myth of the General Strike. Nothing better as yet has been devised to serve as a basis for the hopes of Socialism and to supply the adherents of this system with the inspiration necessary to sustain them in their struggles. Men will soon give up the fight unless they feel convinced that in their efforts they are supported by mighty cosmic trends that guarantee ultimate triumph. It was Marx's theory that gave to the socialistic movement this indispensable cosmic background and thus assured its champions of the coöperation of the universe. Tenaciously Socialism clung to this anchor of its hopes.

The author very clearly shows the inadequacy of the economic theory as an ultimate interpretation of human history. It does not do justice to the complex nature of human phenomena. The foundation which it furnishes is too weak and too narrow to bear the vast superstructure which it is supposed to support. The conclusion at which he arrives is tersely expressed in the following passage: "Upon analysis, the materialistic interpretation proves to fall short of the place claimed for it by its authors and upholders." In this connection the fifteenth chapter of the volume in which the theory is viewed in the light of actual historical development and subjected to severe empirical tests is particularly interesting. Here it is convincingly demonstrated that neither social institutions nor ethical ideas can be said to be dependent on the mode of production that prevails in any given period. The dialectic of history really does not work in the manner in which Marx would have it operate. In

fact, it is a most uncalculable factor that completely disconcerts the theorizer and upsets his predictions. Truthfully does the author say: "The dialectic is a fitful, uncertain, capricious force which knows no regularity or uniformity." Besides at every point non-economic forces enter into the process and deflect it from the course which logically it ought to pursue. The whole theory, then, resolves itself into a mere fanciful construction, a delightful plaything, a toy and nothing more. The final verdict of the author we heartily endorse. It reads: "Marx's theory is impotent to account for historical processes, and the reason is that he failed to ascribe sufficient weight to the many non-economic agencies in history."

The extravagant claims made in behalf of Marx's theory as an instrument of invention and as a stimulating factor in elaborating the methodology of the social sciences are also very much discounted by the author. However, the theory did render valuable service and in many ways promoted social research. It constituted a happy reaction to other equally arbitrary constructions of history and accorded to economic facts the place in historical speculation which had been denied to them by the idealists. "Marx's doctrine", writes Dr. Bober, "was a powerful antidote to older and even more onesided views of history. He called the historians from their lofty imaginings down to the earth of humble economic facts." Valueless as a key to the interpretation of human happenings and totally insufficient as a philosophy of history, Marx's theory is important as a reminder of the fact that material conditions do exert a vital influence in the affairs of men.

Dr. Bober gives us a well balanced study of Marxian philosophy. His criticism is fair and penetrating. We can accept it not only in substance but practically in all its details. The book is unusually well written and abounds in passages that possess the brilliancy and sharpness of outline characteristic of coins fresh from the mint.

C. P. Bruehl.

La Civilisation Chinoise. Le Vie Publique et la Vie Privée. By Marcel Granet. (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. 1929. Pp. xxii, 523.)

The present volume is No. XXV of a collection edited by Henri Berr under the name of *L'Evolution de l'Humanité.* It is the first part of a synthesis on Ancient China; a new volume is promised on

the Thought of the Ancient Chinese. It deals with the origins down to the early Christian centuries, and attempts to give what may be considered as fairly certain and also what is doubtful or positively to be rejected. As might be expected, the early ages are full of legends and myths; the author then takes up the Three Dynasties, Hia, Yin and Tcheou. These were succeeded by a period of feudalism (8th cent. B. C.), which in turn was replaced by the Empire 221 B. C.

The details which M. Granet gives of the public and private life show how every detail of life had been regulated; as a result there arises in our mind the impression that it was an age of formalism where spontaneity had little scope. Granet has foreseen that objection and warns us against jumping at conclusions too quickly. This apparent formalism is mainly an attempt at safeguarding deeper realities as they were understood then. It was not an end in itself but a means to an end. We do not act differently in our civil or religious etiquette.

We consider the present volume as an excellent example of what such a synthesis should be. M. Granet has devoted his life to this field of research and his judgment can be trusted. The work is written in a very interesting and clear style and reads easily. It is impossible in a short review to do justice to the immense labor which this synthesis supposes. Possibly the best appreciation is that of M. Berr himself in the preface of the book. Let us hope that the reader will find as much profit and enjoyment as we have ourselves while going through its pages.

I may add that in America also great interest is being shown in Chinese studies. The American Council of Learned Societies has organized a section for this very purpose. That section held a meeting in December, 1928, and another at Harvard in conjunction with the meeting of the American Oriental Society last spring. All the universities were asked to send delegates; an effort is being made to unify individual studies so as to secure the best results. We may not be as advanced as Europe in the field of Sinology, but a beginning has been made and progress will follow quickly. Such books as Granet's are sure to arouse our emulation and stimulate our zeal.

R. Butin, S. M.

Ancient and Medieval History. By FRANCIS S. BETTEN, S. J. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1928. Pp. 581.)

For some years students in our secondary schools have been familiar with the works of the Reverend Francis S. Betten, S. J. Many of them have read with eager interest the Betten-Kauffman histories and have referred to Father Betten's useful *Historical Facts and Terms.* The present text departs from the arrangement of the first series and is designed to cover in a single volume ancient and medieval history. The modern period will be the subject of a companion volume by the Reverend Alfred Kaufmann, S. J.

The publication of any writing of Father Betten's is of interest. But the reason behind the publication of the present volume, that of providing high-school students with an adequate text, raises the event to a degree of importance. It is true, of course, that all progressive elementary schools give some attention to the story of the Old World. Before entering high school pupils have had some pictures of ancient and medieval history. However, a book of the type of the volume under consideration is the vehicle by which students make their first excursions into this subject matter as organized history. Impressions will grow into view-points. Facts will be comprehended. Events will be interpreted. The view that the high-school student will have of this field of history may be the only one he will ever have. Hence it is highly important that the text be interesting in treatment, full in content and correct in interpretation. These requirements, which in certain aspects are minimal essentials and in others desiderata, Father Betten's volume posseses abundantly.

His book is written in simple language. Each sentence says something. The author has had before him constantly a clear understanding of the capabilities of those who will study his text.

The subject matter has been organized in such manner that history becomes the moving, living march of the people of past ages and not a patch-work of unrelated movements and irrelevant episodes. To impress upon the student the causality of movements and the unity of events, there is at the beginning of each section a summary of the movements whose further development is the subject of the section. This summary gives direction to the student's thought.

To stimulate attention a goodly number of illustrations supplement the text. Pictures of vases, monuments, manuscripts, and other source material help make the text vivid. Of great value are these con-

temporary picturizations of historical events. Photographs of restorations and ruins have been used freely. (The explanatory legends under the captions on pages 252, 363, and 366 are probably an error.) The maps are many and uniformly excellent. They are, happily, not crowded. The point at issue is shown prominently and one map is not made to function for two or three maps. In spite of these excellencies, however, one cannot but deplore the failure of the publisher more fully and more worthily to illustrate this splendid text.

The book is complete. Topics that ought to have place in a book of this sort can invariably be found in Father Betten's volume. This is of considerable moment, because there are other texts actually larger in word content but, nevertheless, incomplete. The author treats the story of mankind from the beginning, relating the history of Adam and Eve, the Deluge, and the providential mission of the Hebrews. That same completeness is observable in his treatment of the medieval period. Peasant and knight, monk and archbishop, manor and town are all treated adequately.

But it is in the matter of interpretation that the author's work is of greatest excellence. There is nothing especially novel in the production of a history text for high-school grades. In the matter of content, with the exceptions already noted, high-school texts treat pretty much the same topics. It is really the author's view-point that matters. A clear conception of the supernatural, a real understanding of the essential changes brought into the world by Christianity, these things give definite direction to the book. In detailed items that same correctness of interpretation is likewise noticeable. There is regular definition of terms wherever this is needed. If, for example, the author speaks of civilization he explains what he means. He is constantly specific.

The pedagogical aids are satisfactory. Some useful suggestions and questions are given to the teacher. Further would be superflous. An honest bibliography is supplied. That is to say, the book lists contain titles that should be readily accessible and not beyond the comprehension of high-school students. The author does not expect young students to do extensive research work.

Altogether the book is a genuine contribution to the furtherance of the understanding of history. Above all, it will promote the truth.

P. J. Furlong.

A History of Rome to 565 A. D. By ARTHUR E. R. BOAK, Ph. D., Professor of Ancient History in the University of Michigan. Revised edition. (New York: Macmillan. 1929. Pp. xx, 476.)

The first edition of Professor Boak's *History of Rome* was published in December of 1927, and since that date has been reprinted six times. This is eloquent testimony of the popularity of the work.

Although this volume is of great interest to the general reader, it was primarily intended as a sketch of the history of Rome to 565 A. D. to meet the needs of introductory college courses in Roman history. The changes in the revised edition have been made with this original purpose in mind.

The general plan and scope of the work have not been changed. While considerable portions have been completely rewritten, the chief changes may be summed up as follows: the incorporation into the narrative of the results of recent progress in the interpretation of the archaeological evidence bearing upon historic Italy and also the contributions made by new and important studies upon political, economic, and other problems of the various periods of Roman history; the introduction into the text of several fine illustrations of Roman art and architecture; an enlarged list of maps, and a greatly improved map as a frontispiece; four genealogical tables; and a list of suggestive collateral readings for the use of college students.

Needless to the say, the usefulness of the book both for the general reader and for the college student has been greatly increased.

ROY J. DEFERRARI.

The Middle Ages. By EDWARD MASLIN HULME. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1929. Pp. xi, 851. $5.50.)

The book under review is in many respects the clearest presentation of medieval life that has thus far been produced in a single volume textbook in English. There are numerous admirable features that make it a valuable manual for the college course in the history of the middle ages. The maps are good and serviceable. The index is complete. The bibliographical notes at the end of each chapter are quite inclusive, listing works in languages other than English. The topical arrangement in place of the strictly chronological, while necessitating frequent repetitions, is a fortunate one in treating an historical period

primarily institutional in its nature and expression. While some might quarrel with Professor Hulme's closing his account with the dawn of the fourteenth century, there is much to be said in favor of his bringing his book to a conclusion before the chaos of the early Renaissance upset the order and unity of the middle ages. The author's frequent use of a leading question to clarify a period or an issue will be of great help to the college student who might become confused in the mass of details.

Some of the more specific advantages which this book has in comparison with other texts on the period are: the excellent chapter on the Germans before they entered the Empire; the generous space given to the Byzantine and the Saracen civilizations; the clarifying chapter on the Normans and their significant contributions to Western Europe; and the brief but adequate treatment of the smaller states (pp. 670 ff.). There are many other features which deserve praise. Space will not permit mention of them all, but some must be recorded. The importance of the Benedictine rule as the last expression of Roman legislative genius (p. 180) and as a great force in the civilizing of the barbarians is properly stressed. The author treats understandingly of the important rôle of the Church in effecting a fusion of races and cultures (pp. 205 ff.). The geographical setting for the rise of Islam is well presented (pp. 214 ff.). The "virtues of feudalism" (pp. 209, 318-319) are not overlooked, as is the case in many texts. The description of medieval fairs is picturesque and cannot fail to impress the student (pp. 609-611). The distinction between Eastern and Western monasticism, with the latter's emphasis upon social service, is clearly drawn (pp. 82-84). The continuity of schools and of a knowledge of books throughout the earlier and darker period of the middle ages is made plain (pp. 195-196). The Saracen civilization is shown to be one that grew by accretion and was not Arabic in its essence (p. 233). The Church is given her proper place as the conservator of civilization; she was "despite the complaints justly made against her, . . . intrinsically superior to the State. The Church, as compared with the State, was the power which incorporated progress. In her hands, for the time being, lay all the forces that raised human life above the low level to which it had fallen" (p. 377). There is genuine insight in Professor Hulme's reason as to why some of the *studia generalia* developed into universities and others did not. Succintly he says: "They were fortunate enough to have famous teach-

ers" (p. 684). He brings out a fact too often neglected when he says that stranglings and burnings for divergent religious beliefs frequently "seem to have been the work chiefly of the people and the secular magistrates and rulers. There are many instances in which heretics were burned despite the opposition of the local bishops" (p. 770).

On the other hand there are certain obvious shortcomings in the book. It seems to this reviewer that Roman institutions do not receive adequate treatment in the opening chapter. The space given to a refutation of the old idea that men approached the year 1000 with dread, seems out of place (p. 325). The average undergraduate probably has never heard of the fiction, which is likely to impress him more than its refutation. The part played by the Italian traders in the Crusades seems greatly under-emphasized (p. 470). The brief and summary treatment of scholastic philosophy, in a chapter entitled "The Church and Heretics", is quite disproportionate and fragmentary in a book purporting to give a survey of the middle ages. The same criticism may be directed at the author's discussion of medieval learning in the concluding chapter. One feels frequently that Professor Hulme is impatient for the Renaissance to come along. Perhaps this should not surprise one in a book from the pen of a scholar known heretofore chiefly for his work in the Renaissance and Reformation periods. But the reader becomes a bit weary of having many good things in medieval civilization emphasized as being foreshadowings of the Renaissance. (See in this connection pages 325, 439, 620, 627, 709, 813, 817.)

There are instances, too, of the author's making assertions that might seriously be called into question. A case in point is this sentence, à propos of the Council of Nicaea: "The gracious history of the Galilean peasant had been supplanted by the mystery cult of the *Khristos*" (p. 29). Recent scholarship would question also the alleged injunction of Mohammed to use arms to force his religion upon others (p. 219). It is doubtful that Mohammed became a "conscious imposter and open sensualist" (p. 220). One cannot be sure that Henry IV was prompted to his penitential act at Canossa merely to be "better able to deal with his enemies at home" (p. 404). And one might well ponder whether the accession of Frederic Barbarossa marked "a halt in the decline of the royal power in Germany" (pp. 502-503), or whether Henry the Lion was a "most daring and vigorous exponent of this stubborn separatism" (p. 513). It is far

more likely that Henry represented the vitality of free Germanic institutions while Barbarossa, in his desperate efforts to break the power of his great opponent, dissipated the royal resources and hastened the bankruptcy of the royal power.

At times Professor Hulme is guilty of assertions or omissions that seem either inaccurate or erroneous. An example is the account of the rise of papal power without any reference to the possible part played by the doctrine of Petrine supremacy (pp. 59-60). It is rather anachronistic to speak of the investitures controversy as a contest between the instincts of nationality and the old religious culture (p. 409); there was no nationalism in the eleventh century. It is unfortunate that the author repeats the old legends regarding the supposed fate of the French boys and girls in the Children's Crusade (p. 479). It is doubtful that Abelard was a nominalist or a conceptualist (p. 689). Three thousand students is a conservative estimate of the average attendance at the University of Paris in the thirteenth century (p. 704). Is it fair or truthful to say that the "scholastics spent their time threshing the husks of theology"? (p. 727). Again, the whole truth about Thomism is certainly not contained in these two sentences: "It is a summary of Christian creeds, Neoplatonism, Aristotelianism, and the venturesome commentaries of the Saracens. Above all else it is a combination of the philosophy of Aristotle and the faith of Augustine" (p. 748). And certainly Professor Hulme is in error in referring to the nuns as clergy (p. 367) or to priests as a caste (p. 406).

There are occasional instances of poorly constructed sentences that successfully keep their meaning to themselves. There are, finally, certain errors in proof-reading that make for rather amusing mistakes, such as the "temporary power" for the temporal power (p. 403), the bestowal of a crown upon Prince Mendowg of Lithuania by "Innocent II" (p. 675), and the founding of the Cistercians nearly a half-century after the death of St. Bernard, their greatest monk (p. 714).

H. B. Vinnedge.

Fathers of the Church: A Selection from the Writings of the Latin Fathers. Translated, with an Introduction and Biographical Notices, by F. A. WRIGHT. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1929. Pp. 351.)

The present volume contains the translation of selections from Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine. These selections have been made with a view to the interest of the topics discussed for the people of today, and treat of such subjects as woman's dress, the unity of the Church, and the relation of sex to the religious life. The author aims to show that the Fathers were not wholly concerned with problems of abstract theology but dealt also with subjects that are still alive. He hopes further to stir the interest of readers of cultivated taste to make deeper explorations in the vast richness of the writings of the Latin Fathers.

The selections chosen for translation have, I believe, in every case been translated before, which to be sure does not militate against their being included in such a volume as this. The translations, while in the main faithful as to interpretation, do little in the way of carrying over the peculiarities of the style of the original. In fact, were we to eliminate all readings as to authorship, we would consider the volume to be a general work by a single author. In other words, as to style, the translation is consistently more F. A. Wright than Tertullian, Cyprian, or any other of the Fathers concerned; and in most instances I would say that the English was on a far higher level of literary worth than the corresponding Latin original. Of course, we are here involved in the complicated question of how to translate.

The general introduction of nineteen pages touches a number of very important subjects but necessarily only cursorily. I have discovered therein no misstatement of fact, but many very striking and illuminating generalizations. The following on the moral character of the Fathers is of special interest:

> It would obviously be absurd to maintain that all the Fathers are faultless either as man or as writers. The devil's advocate might plead that Tertullian was a heretic, and Cyprian ran away from danger; that Arnobius was a semipagan, and Lactantius a simpleton; and that Ambrose was over-ambitious, that Jerome was irritable and vindictive, and that Augustine behaved with callous cruelty to the woman whom he professed to love. In these statements there is just that grain of truth which gives venom to a lie; but all that we really learn from them is something which we know already: no human being is perfect.

And thus too in the short space of a page and a half is discussed with bold sweeping strokes the language and style of these authors, a subject upon which volumes have already been written and which still remains but partially treated. The short discussions of the individual authors before the presentation of their selections serve their purpose well—giving an adequate orientation for understanding what follows.

Of course to understand the Fathers properly we must read their works in the original language. For a person, however, who has an imperfect grasp of that language and wishes to acquire some knowledge of what the Fathers were concerned about or even some understanding of their character, this volume will be found useful.

ROY J. DEFERRARI.

The History of Nursing. By JAMES J. WALSH, M. D., Ph. D. (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. 1929.)

In this volume Dr. Walsh finds a congenial field for his talents as a writer and an historian. Long concerned as he has been with the history of science as related to the Church, and especially with the history of the development of medical knowledge, it would be strange indeed if he had not accumulated a wealth of material concerning the practices of nursing and the routine of hospitals, especially during the medieval period.

In the *Popes and Science,* Dr. Walsh had the controversial task of setting aright many misconceptions and misstatements which had been set forth in a volume by an American educator concerning the alleged warfare of theology with science. How well he did this task is probably better appreciated abroad than in America; although the most authoritative historian of medicine in English, Fielding Garrison, in his *History of Medicine,* quotes Walsh a dozen times and Andrew White not at all.

In discussing the history of nursing Dr. Walsh had no controversy on his hands. The excellent two-volume work of Nutting and Dock contained nothing that any Catholic historian could take exception to, and the author of this new and shorter history frequently gives these authors credit for statements concerning nursing in the religious orders, especially during the Middle Ages.

However, Dr. Walsh's volume, as might be expected, contains a great deal of hitherto unpublished material concerning memorable activities

of religious communities in the nursing field, as for instance the origin and works of the first Sisters of Mercy, and Sisters of Charity and Mother Seton's foundation of the American Sisters of Charity.

Naturally the chapters on medieval hospitals, medieval surgery and nursing, and the work of the crusading nursing orders are written with an authoritative fluency which shows his familiarity with this period and its customs. His discussion of disease prevention during the Middle Ages might be questioned, but that he quotes the great Karl Sudhoff as his authority—Sudhoff who was twice urged by non-German scientists as a fit recipient for the Nobel prize in history. In fact, this disconcerting habit of confronting the possible questioner with excellent authorities is found rather generally wherever it seems needed in this small volume—as for example when he brings up Hurter and Virchow to substantiate his assertion that excellent hospitals were built and maintained in the thirteenth century, and Albutt to describe the antiseptic methods employed by the medieval surgeons such as Theodoric and Hugo of Lucca.

The part played by Florence Nightingale in the evolution of the modern nurses' training school is not slighted. He quotes some interesting correspondence with Father (later Cardinal) Manning, as when she wrote "there is nothing like the training, in these days, which the Sacred Heart or the Order of St. Vincent gives to women," and her letters to Mother McAuley of the Sisters of Mercy, who accompanied her to the Crimea. Especially interesting is the one written to Mother McAuley when the latter was obliged to return, in which she says with her characteristic frankness: "You were far above me in fitness for the general superintendency in worldly talent of administration and far more in the Spiritual qualifications which God values in a Superior."

The history of the evolution of the hospital administered by religious into the modern training school type would be interesting if Dr. Walsh had undertaken its compilation; and there is also excellent material available in the story of the religious hospitals that followed in the wake of missionary priests in the wastes of Alaska and northern Canada.

All in all the volume furnishes a well-rounded view of the progress of nursing, especially as developed by the Catholic religious orders, and should be, because of its accuracy and compactness, invaluable as a text in the curriculum of nurses' training schools.

JOHN A. FOOTE.

English Ecclesiastical Studies, Being some Essays in Research in Medieval History. By ROSE GRAHAM, M. A., F. S. A. Somerville College, Oxford. (London, S. P. C. K.; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1929. Pp. xiii, 463.)

The publishers of this volume have done a good service to the cause of medieval studies in bringing together these valuable papers which otherwise would have been inaccessible to the majority of students of the Middle Ages and condemned to oblivion by being buried in the files of different publications and the proceedings of various learned Societies. The topics to which the author turned her attention are mainly monastic and diocesan. She has gone through the records with discriminating and painstaking thoroughness and as result much light is cast on many obscure features of monastic life and church administration in medieval England. It is a relief to find that there is a side to monastic life in England worthy of the attention of a scholarly student different from that presented in the atrabiliar pages of the Cambridge savant, Professor Coulton. As might be expected from the author's previous study on Gilbert of Sempringham and the Gilbertines, her survey of English monasticism is not confined to one order or to any particular feature of monastic life. Here she devotes much attention to the Order of Cluny and to that of Grandmont, but her researches in these fields are equally valuable in arriving at a knowledge of the affairs, principally economic and administrative, of the other orders with English foundations in thirteenth century England. The work will be invaluable not only to students of English monasticism but to those who are interested in English social and political life.

P. J. H.

The British Church from the Days of Cardinal Allen. By FATHER PAUL, O.S.F.C. (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. 1929. Pp. xxxii, 237. 15s.)

With the triumph of the Reformation in England during the first year of Elizabeth's reign (1559), the story of the Catholic Church in that country reached what may well be termed its greatest turning-point. From 1581, when Parliament passed the act which made it high treason to absolve or to withdraw anyone from the royal obedience or from the established religion, to the year 1685, when John Ley-

burne became first vicar-apostolic of all England, the condition of the Church in England was for all practical purposes acephalous. It is true that Dr. William Allen was appointed by Gregory XIII "Prefect to the English Mission" and that after Cardinal Allen's death (1594), a number of archpriests followed (1598-1623), to be succeeded by two vicars-apostolic (1623-1655) and by another interval of thirty years before John Leyburne was consecrated. Probably no Church, suffering collapse under the Reform movement, presents a more pathetic figure than that of England.

And yet the picture is not altogether a tragic or somber one. The truth is that with all the weapons for "eradicating popery" furnished to the English Crown by a subservient Parliament, the old Faith never actually died out. Even after the penal laws had done their worst in that fearful period of persecution from Elizabeth to William and Mary, it is difficult not to avoid the conclusion that the strength of Catholicism in the British Isles was surprisingly vigorous.

Father Paul has not given us a history of the Church in the British Isles from 1581 to the present. That is not his purpose. Tanner, Gasquet, Birt, Phillips, Camm, Taunton, Burton, Foley, Knox, Oliver, Tierney, Ward, Pollen, Gillow and others, have done that. As he says: "Much has already been written on the subject, so the present volume will be an attempt to bring together a series of illustrations which may be helpful as a supplement to all that has been so ably written by many learned authors, past and present." Consequently the book is a clearly designed portrayal of all those ecclesiastics who stand out in modern British history. Each portrait is flanked by a short biographical sketch, and the book has pictures of the leading churches and cathedrals and a goodly number of maps to illustrate the growth of Catholicism in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales in the last four hundred years. A portrait of Bishop Walmsley, who consecrated John Carroll in 1790, is in the collection. There is an excellent index. Few works in recent years of an historical nature from the pen of an English Catholic surpass this volume in uniqueness and skill, and the book itself is artistically a typographical success.

P. G.

Mary II, Queen of England, 1689-1694. By NELLIE M. WATERSON. (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press. 1928. $2.50.)

The soul of Thomas Babington Macaulay must have rejoiced exceedingly when Miss Waterson's spirited eulogy of "Mary II, Queen of England", left the press. His own eulogy was as spirited as a military march; but it carried little conviction, because his readers knew that he had merely said what he had started out to say, and that if Mary had been a British Messalina instead of a well-conducted person he would have brought in the same verdict.

Miss Waterson's book is to be commended in that it does not in the least resemble the type of royal biography (amatory for the most part) which has been popular of late years, and which might be classed under the head of historical Town Topics. *Mary II* is not Town Topical, it is documentary. Ancient papers are hunted up, and their evidence carefully sifted. By their light the Queen stands revealed as a woman of moderate intelligence and irreproachable morals, pious, well- meaning, and distrustful. There really was no one in whom she could put her trust. The aim and object of English statesmen was to limit the royal prerogatives. Mary found them, as Victoria found the Commons later on, "very troublesome". She entertained the same sentiment toward the bishops, whom William disliked, and whom she but dimly understood.

If, as Miss Waterson boldly asserts, this Stewart princess felt a "strong affection for her father", she gave no visible proof, not even as much as taste required, of such a sentiment. If she wrote pathetically, "My heart is not made for a kingdom", she was sufficiently alacritous about accepting one. The advice of Bernard Shaw's "Caesar" to the little Ptolemy, "Always take a throne if it is offered to you," has seldom been disregarded. "It cannot be too much emphasized", says Miss Waterson, "that Mary never believed in the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales." But then who does believe, or who ever has believed, in anything which it is to his or her interest to doubt. Incredulity under such circumstances assumes the status of a virtue.

The Queen's strongest characteristic was her abiding affection for her husband. He was unfaithful, and most consistently disagreeable to her. Indeed he was constitutionally incapable of being anything but disagreeable to anyone. The illustrious Caroline of Ansbach also loved an unfaithful and unprepossessing little husband; but George

II was never rude or surly to his wife, and he wrote her letters that might have won and held any intelligent woman. William was jealous of his consort's popularity. Not that she was popular, for she was not, popularity being reserved for Anne; but it would have been difficult to be as wholly unpopular as was the Dutch king. Mary knew his worth as a ruler, and she was content with him as a man. She guarded his interests, smoothed when she could the friction he created, subjected herself in all things to his authority, and was known in her time as "the most complying wife in the world". Even in the quarrel with her sister, she heartily espoused her husband's side, and concurred in a series of petty persecutions which aroused on Anne's behalf the indiscriminate partisanship of the public.

It was a curious family group, and an unlovely one. "The Queen talked, the King thought, and the Princess ate." Mary was a rigid sabbatarian, and strict in all religious observances. She desired that "pecuniary mulcts" should be inflicted upon the servants of her household who failed to attend prayers at seven, a. m. Anne, she complained, "laughed at afternoon sermons, and did in little things contrary to what I did." Mary, who was esteemed an economist, bought thirty-six pairs of satin and gold lace slippers in four months, and Anne clamoured incessantly for a larger income. Striving to preserve an impartial attitude, but with her sympathies all pulling one way, Miss Waterson scrupulously records the five years' reign. One sentence only in the book calls for interpretation. What does she mean when she speaks of "the Titus Oates *revelations*"?

AGNES REPPLIER.

James the Second. By HILAIRE BELLOC. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. Pp. 298.)

Mr. Belloc has always been a crusader, frequently a romantic knight-errant with a slight touch of Quixotism. Some years ago, he mounted his steed to save that fair princess, Marie Antoinette. Now we see him spurring across the plain to save another reputation. There will be some who will see in that steed close kin of Rosinante and wonder why Sir Hilaire seeks to save an ogre and not to slay it according to all the laws of chivalry. There has never been any doubt as to Mr. Belloc's courage and, if there had been, the present volume would set it at rest, for only a brave man would attempt to defy so deeply rooted

a tradition of dislike and distrust as that which surrounds the name and person of James II. On the other hand, the wonder is that he did not attempt it before. It has always been agreed that James fell a victim to his opposition to the Whig plutocracy. This plutocracy, though most critics regard it as the saviour of the kingdom from a Bourbon-minded monarch, has always been Mr. Belloc's pet aversion. Again, as he sees it, James strove to perpetuate, or rather to re-create, the popular monarchy, which is the author's political ideal.

For this reason, the book must be approached with some caution. Mr. Belloc is nearly always the proponent of a thesis, always well worked out and generally one with which this reviewer agrees, but, too frequently, the arguments contra are slighted and omitted. In this case, the book is more than a thesis, it is counsel's appeal for a rehearing of the case of James II *vs.* Tradition. While we believe that the attorney for the plaintiff makes out a very good case, that the previous verdict was secured by falsification of the record in a prejudiced court and that the verdict cannot stand without substantial modification, we feel that judgment must be suspended until the rebuttals are heard.

The Stuarts were an unfortunate family. Their rule in Scotland was never a stable one and, when they achieved the throne of England, they brought to it a theory of government that had but little sanction in English law or custom, despite Mr. Belloc's assertion to the contrary, and which, coming as it did at the very moment when the nobles were beginning to feel their power, could not fail to produce discord. James II, fully believing this theory, was doubly unfortunate. Had he, instead of his brother, succeeded at the Restoration, the popularity of the Crown might have enabled him to limit the power of the plutocracy and won for him some slight success, but after his brother, resolved "not to go on his travels again", had sacrificed the realities of kingship that he might retain its trappings in comfort, it was too late for any reaction. This James could not see and he paid the price for his lack of insight. It is quite clear that James's religion had little part in raising the aristocratic faction against him, though it was their most useful weapon. They would have tolerated James the Catholic if he had been content to be a figurehead and to leave control in the hands of the Russells and their allies. Even if he had been a Protestant, he would have fallen, as his father fell, so long as he was resolved to rule as well as to reign.

This Mr. Belloc shows clearly. Furthermore he emphasizes and, we think, proves, what the Whig historians have denied, the essential patriotism of James and the innate nobility of his character. In these days of naval disarmament, too, it is of interest to read the author's claim that the King, as Duke of York, was the founder of the English Navy as a permanent effective military arm, a claim that can be justified in part by reference to Pepys, who was secretary to the Navy Board. So intense is his patriotism and his enthusiasm for his creation that he cannot restrain his satisfaction when an English fleet destroys the French fleet which was to re-establish him upon his throne. Again he is a typical Englishman of his time in his callous disregard of Ireland and the Irish, which even his Catholicism does not soften.

In spite of his looseness in sexual matters, he is honest and straightforward and these characteristics have much to do with his downfall. He has not the statesman's art of lying and dissimulation; he cannot compromise on essentials. To this he added an astonishing ignorance of human nature which made him an easy prey to traitors. He was no match for William of Orange and his allies who bribed, flattered, lied, and forged their way to a success which, for two hundred and fifty years, has placed England at the mercy of a plutocratic oligarchy. In this regard, it is noteworthy that at the end of the Great War, public sentiment was so aroused that had the present king willed, as he was urged by many distinguished soldiers and statesmen, to revive the popular monarchy of the Stuarts, he would probably have succeeded. Probably, before many years, one of his successors will do so. Therein lies the probable solution of the difficulties raised by the collapse of capitalism in England.

Of James's loyalty to the Church there can be no doubt, and for his equal devotion to the principle of toleration, as exemplified by the Declaration of Indulgence, Mr. Belloc makes a good case. What he omits, and there are other such omissions, is that the indiscreetness of the Declaration was realized by Rome and the king warned. But it was useless to warn James when he felt that a principle was at stake.

Certainly James was a finer man than tradition will allow. Whether he was as great a man as Mr. Belloc maintains, in his magnificently written work, is not so clear. The book will be attacked unmercifully, the more so since it goes down to the very root of things and strikes at the basis of the tradition. Again Mr. Belloc scorns the citation of

documents and sources, though he does not disdain to use them, and this is anathema to many historians and critics. But, however one judges the book, two things cannot be denied: the book needed writing and Mr. Belloc was the man to write it.

ANSELM M. TOWNSEND, O. P.

John Gerson: Reformer and Mystic. By JAMES L. CONNOLLY, M. A., S. T. B., Docteur en Sciences Historiques (Lovan). (Louvain: Libraire Universitaire, Uystpruyst, Ed. 1928. Pp. xiii, 392.)

The present volume is the first biography in English worthy of the foremost, if not the leader, among churchmen of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The life of John Gerson (1363-1429) spans a period in the history of the Church noted chiefly for the conflicting currents of thought which flowed through it. It is a time in which the exile of the Popes at Avignon, the Western Schism, the Conciliar Movement, and the novel pretensions of the delegates at the Council of Constance (1414-1418) had served to arouse many conflicting opinions in regard to the supremacy of the papal power. It is also, and we might say consequently, a period of theorizing in the matter of Church reform "in head and in members", since these movements had brought in their current much that did not measure up to Christian ideals and practice. It is moreover an interval in the life of the University of Paris when the Nominalism of Occam had for a time triumphed over the Realism of the schools. And its years are prolific in the movements of revolt in matters of, or relating to, faith; in false concepts of established revelation; and in dangerous and heretical types of mysticism.

John Gerson stood in the midst of this chaotic era. In his days the University of Paris was the mother of learning in continental Europe, and, as its chancellor, he naturally held an important rôle in the affairs of Church and State. Had he been able to arrange his life in accord with his natural inclinations, Gerson would have passed his days in the seclusion of the cloister. Circumstances of the time however drove his fearless spirit into the whirling conflicts of the day, and only the last few years of his life afforded him the solace of assured retirement. An interpretation, therefore, of the life of the great chancellor is best secured from the vantage point of his work as scholar, reformer and mystic. The life of Gerson in these guises should establish his

relationship with the above-mentioned movements and portray their effect upon him as well as his effect upon them. In the present interpretative biography Doctor Connolly, in line with the best traditions of the historical school of Louvain, has accomplished this with complete satisfaction. In this doctoral dissertation he gives a fulsome treatment of the conflicting events of Gerson's day, and, while leaving much for our own conclusion as to the place of this great churchman, he prepares for him the niche in the history of the closing years of medieval life which he richly deserves.

It is chiefly as reformer and mystic that Gerson is presented to us. These rôles of Gerson are viewed by the author as separate entities, but in depicting his zealous efforts for reform and the proper understanding of the ultimate pursuit of Christian perfection, these inevitably blend, as the author points out, into a harmonious whole, the two being mutually complimentary in the life and activity of Gerson.

Much is treated in this work that brings us far into the field of controversy. Questions such as the position of Gerson in the reform movements, the early Gallicanism, the Conciliar theory, and the extent to which he was influenced by the teachings of William of Occam demand discussion and explanation. In treating these matters the author is deserving of much commendation for his masterful and impartial appraisal of his subject. Much as he evidently admires Gerson—and who does not after becoming in any degree intimate with the priestly life of the great chancellor, yet he does not hesitate to point out the flaws that, for some, have marred his greatness. He shows conclusively, however, that justice demands that Gerson be exonerated of much that has been wrongfully attributed to him. In the reform movements of his day, Gerson was meeting the beginnings of a movement which would culminate in the religious revolt of the sixteenth century. A false mysticism based on so-called religious experience, was making many individuals aid groups potentially a religion unto themselves. Against these he sternly but kindly upheld the principle of an authority, disciplinary and directive, which would safely guide them over the charted course of tradition and enable them to steer clear of the shoals of error, not the least of which was a return to pantheism. He would encourage the seeking after union with God, but wisely tempered his counsel to the abilities of the aspirant and warned all that it would be safe and sufficient to know and live the

truths which Holy Mother Church teaches and not to strive to sound the nature of God. That, he maintained, would be the reward and privilege of heaven. Too often the name of John Gerson has been linked with self-constituted reformers, such as Wyclif and Hus in his own day, and Luther in the century which followed. But, as Doctor Connolly ably demonstrates, Gerson had little or nothing in common with these. For him, it was not necessary to raze the walls of the Church to repair a breach in them. Unlike these reformers, he made a clear distinction between the right use of authority and its abuse through human frailty. He was convinced that no radical change was needed in Church polity in order to bring about the reform. No one of that era appreciated more keenly than he, the prevailing laxity in high places, and the low standard of morality and devotion among the people; but his was a policy of restoration rather than of rebuilding. Above all he could set the example himself in the matter of reform. With bold confidence he could say: "Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ." Following the convincing arguments of von Pastor and Hauck, the author shows that the Gallican legend has been built up largely on the insecure foundation of a tract that was written by Deitrich of Nieheim and falsely attributed to Gerson. In regard to the advancement of the Conciliar theory full admission is made to the dominant rôle which Gerson played in giving life and breath to the claim that an Ecumenical Council was superior in authority to the Pope. Yet here we must not forget that in the awful dilemma of the schism, when two and later three claimants were urging upon the Christian world their right to the papal prerogatives, it is no cause for wonder, let alone for condemnation, if an earnest seeker for truth should try to find a way by which the terrible and scandalous breach might be healed legitimately, and the disciplinary power, so needed for a proper reform, restored to the Church. As regards the influence of Occam's nominalism, it is shown by unmistakable evidence that Gerson's discipleship to the teaching and theories of the English scholar was short-lived. As chancellor of the university he was largely instrumental in restoring Realism to its rightful place in its halls. And effecting this restoration, he did much to prepare the university to cope successfully with the pretensions of the reformers of the sixteenth century.

Much has been written of the life and teachings of Gerson, but the present volume is the first thorough treatment that has been presented

in English. Added to this, we are indebted to the author for much additional data in the life of Gerson, and for the attractive manner in which he portrays the priestly spirit of one on whom the Church can look with justifiable pride as one of the most loyal of her chidren. If this book has a mission to fulfill, it is to make this admirable character better known and understood. To that end we wish it deserved success and congratulate the author on his scholarly and impartial presentation of the life and spirit of this devoted son of the Church.

GEORGE C. POWERS.

After Fifty Years. By O. R. VASSALL-PHILLIPS, C. SS. R. (New York: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 192.)

Having in mind Father Vassall-Phillips's long experience as a Redemptorist and a missionary in England, this reviewer rather anticipated finding in this book a sketch of things seen, heard, and done during these years, with some account of the writer's conversion to the Faith just half a century ago. This expectation was not fulfilled. Instead, the author, looking back fifty years to the time of his conversion, has written his apologia and welded it into an apologetic. As an apologia, it lacks the intensity of Newman, to demand which would be unreasonable, and the wit and the literary finish of Ronald Knox's "Spiritual Aeneid", but it is still of great interest. After all these years, the distinguished convert re-states his difficulties at the time of his great decision and evaluates them from the vantage point of his subsequent experience. Then, from his own experience both as a convert and an instructor of converts, he develops his apologetic. He stresses, as does every convert, the fact that, granted belief in Jesus Christ, the fundamental act of faith is "Credo in sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam." It is his experience, and we think that he is right in laying it down as a general law, that this act of faith is the great obstacle, which overcome, the rest of the doubts become merely difficulties, which time, study and the grace of God will resolve. While Father Vassall-Phillips has given us an interesting piece of his autobiography, the whole of which would be distinctly worth while, his chief service, as it was his chief aim, is his very valuable contribution to the literature of apologetics and the psychology of conversion.

ANSELM M. TOWNSEND, O. P.

A Literary History of Religious Thought in France. By HENRI BREMOND. Vol. I. *Devout Humanism.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1928. Pp. xxiii, 423. $4.50.)

The true humanist, drawing his inspiration from the best in ancient culture, is an optimist and a lover of life. If he is a Christian, he finds his philosophy in no way incompatible with his faith, but rather a manifestation of it. The late Ludwig von Pastor, in his monumental *History of the Popes,* dwelt with understanding on the Christian aspects of the Italian Renaissance. Recently, Professor Rand's delightful *Founders of the Middle Ages* made clear the indebtedness of early Christian thinkers to the writers of classical antiquity. Meanwhile, the Abbé Bremond was collecting materials for this first volume of his *Literary History,* which presents an erudite and attractive picture of devout humanism in the seventeenth century.

The author, after calling attention to the fact that humanism "essentially tends to glorify human nature," explains that Christian humanism is not a sect but an attitude of mind: "Without neglecting any of the essential truths of Christianity, it brings forward by preference those which appear the most consoling, encouraging, in a word *human,* which to it seem the most divine and the most conformed to Infinite Goodness." Doctrinally, Christian humanism and devout humanism are in agreement; but in effect, "Christian Humanism is speculative rather than practical, aristocratic rather than popular," whereas devout humanism is "before all else a school of personal holiness", with a curriculum adapted not only to the spiritual élite but also to the simplest souls among the faithful. It applies to the needs of the inner life, it brings within the reach of all the principles and the spirit of Christian humanism. Its true nature may be grasped very readily when one realizes that Francis de Sales was its most distinguished exemplar. St. Francis, however, though the protagonist of the movement, was not its founder. He had many precursors, the greatest among them being Louis Richeome who unceasingly aimed to make religion attractive. A painter as well as a writer, fond of nature and the lower animals, this literary Jesuit consistantly drew out the best in mankind by expecting the best. He opposed pessimism and urged the faithful to fix their minds on the infinite goodness of God. Thus in his writings he foreshadowed the *Introduction to the Devout Life.*

The author next turns his attention to St. Francis de Sales, who

while not the originator of devout humanism adapted and popularized the movement. Abbé Bremond calls the Salesian spirit its most exact and perfect expression. The Bishop of Geneva was as detached as he was kindly and quiet free from self-conscious humility and worried preoccupation with self. "If no created being had power to absorb François de Sales," writes Abbé Bremond, "his own nothingness did not absorb him either." He deprecated, as likely to defeat its own end, even undue concern in the correction of faults and in the acquisition of virtues. Though he early repudiated the Thomist conception of the operation of grace, there was nothing soft in his dealings with himself or others. The way to perfection might be through appalling sacrifices, but each step of the spiritual journey should leave the soul not agitated or fearful but, in its inmost depths, suave and serene. In every-day life the spirit and method of Francis de Sales may be illustrated by the following incident:

> When I was in Paris (says the Saint), and preached in the Queen's Chapel upon the Day of Judgment—not a controversial sermon—there was present a young lady, Mlle de Perdreauville, (Protestant), who had come out of curiosity; she was caught in the net and as a result of this sermon resolved to seek instruction, and three weeks later brought her whole family to confess to me and stood sponsor for them all at their Confirmation. Now, you see, that sermon, in which nothing was said of heresy, nevertheless breathed against it. . . . I have said ever since that whoever preaches with love, preaches sufficiently against heretics, though he may say never a controversial word.

His doctrine spread after his death. Étienne Binet and Jeane-Pierre Camus were its chief interpreters. The Jesuit Binet wrote voluminously, delighting in words and phrases; though he lacked the delicacy and restraint of his master, he disseminated the same ideas of cheerfulness and calm. The following charmingly naïve extract from one of his spiritual works breathes forth his spirit:

> The Old Testament is the law of severity, where the language is of dead bodies and thunder bolts and of the God of Armies. Now what did He gain by that? He made every one flee from Him, scarce any wished to serve Him; they would speak rather of Moses than of Him. In the New Testament the Incarnate Word called Himself a Lamb. . . . this sweetness drew the heart of the world.

Camus, the Bishop of Belley, was more speculative than the others, but he too, emphasized not divine justice but divine love. He spoke of "the clear-shining of the joy that is in the service of God." The

devout humanists expressed their joyous faith in poetry as well as in prose. The quotations which the author gives from various writers contain numerous classical allusions and radiate innocent humor. There is, for instance, one priceless gibe at popular fads in saints.

Devout humanism linked learning with life and therefore inspired religious studies of wide appeal. It is no wonder that among other forms of literature lives of the saints abounded, which, by furnishing models for the devout life, paved the way for that mystical revival which was the fruit of devout humanism. The craving for universal knowledge led to devout encyclopedias. There were also mirthful dialogues and elaborate religious romances. This literature was permeated by an appreciation of all that was beautiful in nature and in art and by an inculcation of the natural virtues, such as courtesy. There were, to be sure, excesses and inconsistencies in the movement. Indolent and insincere souls might abuse its doctrine of mercy and love, and "P. Binet, railing coarsely against women, temporarily abjures Humanism," just as "Port-Royal forgets its own doctrine when it sets out to translate Terence." At its best, however, devout humanism led to that pure love of God which is inspired neither by fear of punishment nor hope of recompense. It was bound to conflict with Jansenism's somber creed and rigid practice. Francis Bonal rebuked the conviction that God did not will to save all souls, and the learned Capuchin, Yves of Paris, warned of the effect of gloomy theology on the soul of the striving Christian who, figuring God "under impossible and unreasonable conditions, finally ceases to believe in or to adore Him."

The student of ecclesiastical history and of literature will revel in this scholarly and brilliant book which is admirably translated by K. L. Montgomery. It will also prove of great practical value to those who teach and preach, for there are still Jansenists in our midst unwittingly engaged in creating apostates and nervous wrecks. If they are not too self-righteous, they may learn from these pages that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty and cheerfulness and peace.

GEORGIANA PUTNAM MCENTEE.

The Heroic Life of St. Vincent de Paul. By HENRI LAVEDAN. Translated by HELEN YOUNGER CHASE. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1929. Pp. 279. $2.50.)

A bold venture, that of presenting in English garb the life of the most popular Saint of France, written by the most elusive word-painter and subtle novelist of whom contemporary French literature may boast. Yet in putting down the volume one feels that, on the whole, the gallant Academician could not refuse a hearty *satisfecit* to his talented interpreter. He might not fancy overmuch, we surmise, the jacket in which the book is offered to American readers, with its picture of the hero in garish colors. Still less must he be pleased with the illustration facing page 42, though it claims to reproduce a painting by Maurice Denis. The great brow, the large ears, the sunken cheeks, the toothless mouth and the nose, "that famous nose, powerful and thick," which were Vincent de Paul's at sixty (p. 262), we may admit; but frankly not that caricature which would have delighted the heart of a Jansenist. Then what of the "young priests" whom St. Vincent is instructing, all gray-haired and bald-pated, and with faces not over-sympathetic? This, however, is a matter to be settled between Lavedan and the publisher, or Maurice Denis himself.

The French title of the book: *Monsieur Vincent Aumônier des Galères,* is not felicitous, as it seems to limit the narrative to one phase of the Saint's activity. The work, however, comes as No. 17 of a collection labelled *Le Roman des Grandes Existences.* Most happily has the translator combined the true subject of the book—a study of the hero's life and work—with the general idea of the collection, and devised the new title, *The Heroic Life of St. Vincent de Paul.* Of her rendering of the French original the least which can be said is that so fully has she entered into the spirit of the author, so genuinely English is her diction, so completely free from the foreign turns which too frequently mar the best translations, that it makes delightful reading, and one has to turn back to the title-page to be assured he has at hand a translation, and not an original work. Truth to tell, this perfection of form was not obtained without taking now and then some slight liberties with the text. Once in a while a line or two, perhaps thought too highly poetical to appeal to less imaginative readers, is quietly omitted. At other times one is puzzled and wonders why the English, whilst following closely its French prototype, yet departs from it in a detail, thus altering the thought. A case in point: page

9 we read: "*There are storms* (italics mine) during which the flock may often not reach the fold but remain out all night." The French refers, on the contrary, to fair summer nights—"la belle saison"—during which indeed the flock often does not return to the fold, but remains out all night. Leaving aside the implication of hardship on the flock unable to reach the fold on a stormy night, an idea not only alien, but opposite to the author's mind, the difference is quite striking, and there appears to be no obvious reason for the change. This once, then, and in a few other like instances, the translator's attention flagged, as was scarcely avoidable in the course of two hundred and eighty long pages. The fact is mentioned simply because the rendering is regularly so accurate that one is surprised to meet these flaws. Well, Homer himself is said to have nodded at times. In one important instance, however, the meaning not of Lavedan, but of St. Vincent himself, whose words are correctly reported by the historian, was not correctly grasped. Shortly before dying the Saint had fallen into a kind of coma. He rallied after some time, and learning of what deep sleep he had just awakened, he remarked, with his comprehending smile—at least according to the translator: "I am waiting for my sister", meaning death. Now Vincent de Paul never belonged to the poetical school of St. Francis of Assisi: such expressions as "Brother Wolf", "Brother Sun", "Sister Moon", or "Sister Death" never crossed his lips. What he did say, though, in that supreme instant, alluding to the kinship popularly established between sleep and death (remember Virgil's "consanguineus leti sopor"), was simply: "It was the brother"—sleep, of the masculine gender in French—, "the forerunner of the sister"—death, of the feminine gender in French—: "C'est le frère qui vient, en attendant la soeur".

But *paullo maiora canamus*, and under its elegant English dress let us examine more closely Henri Lavedan's story. Try as he may, a novelist can never adjust the folds of the historian's toga so as to hide completely his real self. What reader will have the bad grace of blaming him, though, seeing that even when he has nothing new to reveal, an artist always finds new ways of captivating our interest by saying *nove non nova?* Whether Lavedan depicts St. Vincent as a shepherd boy, or as a slave in Tunis; whether he follows him into the palaces of the rich or the hovels of the poor; whether he tells the story of his magnificent creations, or ushers us into the bare room where the Saint is dying, at every turn the picture, always an exquisite master-

piece, stirs our deepest emotions and irresistibly draws us to the hero whom it sweetly forces us to admire. Indeed the author of *Monsieur Vincent Aumônier des Galères* is a matchless artist. Too much perhaps, as a matter of fact, to serve with singleness of heart at the shrine of history. Accustomed as he is to marshal at will the events of his stories and the reactions thereto of his *dramatis personae,* how can he resist the temptation of marshaling likewise the circumstances surrounding the events of history, and heed the stern caution that

Le vrai peut quelquefois n'être pas vraisemblable,

and conversely, the most plausible explanation may not be true to facts? Then again how can his life-long habits of mind, the free rein he is wont to give to his imagination and his worship of art and beauty suffer the austere restraints and the amputations imposed by historical criticism? Even though St. Vincent lived in the glaring light of yesteryears, and not in the shadows of remote past ages, still legend has succeeded in forcing its way into his history; and legends are so poetical. Lavedan did not resist their charms. Nay more, is it not to be feared that his acceptance of these legends, and the new grace added to them by the magic of his pen may give them a new lease on life? Yet mere legend, despite the author's earnest plea and Bonnat's famous painting, the story so dramatically re-told of St. Vincent taking on the galley bench the place and the fetters of a galley slave; legend likewise the tale of the Saint's nightly excursions through the streets of Paris in search of abandoned infants. The life of the "father of the poor" is rich enough in wonders for needing none of these disproven, though highly romantic, excrescences.

Contrary to what all the historians of St. Vincent de Paul have unanimously repeated since the day of his death, the Servant of God was born not in 1576, but in 1581, as has been conclusively demonstrated by the editor of his works (P. Coste, *Saint Vincent de Paul: Correspondance, Entretiens, Documents.* 14 volumes. Paris, 1920-1925. See Vol. I, p. 593, Note 13). Lavedan, who is not ignorant of this conclusion and declares in an Appendix (which, by the way, was omitted by the translator), he does not absolutely reject it, yet stands by the long adopted erroneous date. A writer more historically minded would have shown less timidity. For facts are facts, and in this matter of his age, the Saint is our best informant. In what little has come down to us of his numerous writings and speeches he

mentions his age on twelve different occasions, some of which were particularly solemn, as when he testified under oath at the process of beatification of St. Francis de Sales (April 17, 1628) and at the inquiry held at the Archbishopric of Paris about the notorious Saint Cyran (March 31, April 1 and 2, 1639), or again when he wrote, on April 27, 1655, his congratulations to Pope Alexander VII, just recently elected. Always his declarations are in perfect agreement on this point of his age. For by no means indeed was he the simpleton of whom Maynard wrote pityingly: "Never did the good Saint know exactly how old he was." With his own testimony agree those of Father de Gondi and of his own last secretary, Brother Louis Robineau, who were in good position to know. Whatever interesting and knotty questions arise from this new date (for it is none the less certain that St. Vincent was promoted to the priesthood on September 23, 1600), this is not the place to discuss. And whilst regretting the ultra-conservatism of the Saint's new historian in this matter of dates, we gladly subscribe to his parting words in the above-mentioned Appendix: "This inaccuracy—if inaccuracy it be—changes nothing from the earnest and pious homage I had at heart to pay to St. Vincent, which was my paramount purpose." That he has magnificently paid this homage, and that not a little of his merit is reflected on his able translator, every reader of *The Heroic Life* will readily agree.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY, C. M.

Saint Francis de Sales, Theologian of Love. By HENRI BORDEAUX of the French Academy, translated by Sister Benita. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1929. Pp. xvi, 282. $2.50.)

The "posthumous friendship of . . . his Savoyard neighbor and colleague, many generations removed", according to the words of the author, Henri Bordeaux (Introduction, page xvi), is responsible for the editing of *St. Francis de Sales, Theologian of Love.* The book is written from the angle of friendship and admiration. It would seem almost as a *parti pris.* The author asks the reader to accept it from the same angle: "I trust that the reader will have ever before his eyes that face so infinitely gentle yet so majestic, so peaceful yet so forceful, a face so sweet and radiant that it poured peace as a balm into all wounded hearts" (page 85). The advocates of the devil in

St. Francis de Sales' cause (such as Souday, page xv, and Father de la Riviere, page 76, and Abbé Francis Vincent, page 81) are summarily dealt with by his enthused champion who always *a priori* denies their suppositum, upon the grounds of his own intimate and thorough acquaintance with this beloved fellow countryman, fellow-academician (Introduction, page xvi), and fellow-believer of his. "Search his life; weigh his thoughts; sound the depths of his heart; you will find . . ." (page 88). Henri Bordeaux gives evidence in each page of his book of having done this and, therefore, of being in a position to challenge all critics. He openly admits this: "I was well acquainted with his writings and twice had made a thorough study of his life and doctrines" (Introduction, page xi). "When one comes upon a passage such as this, one reaps the reward for browsing about old book-stores where, year after year, musty tomes, pregnant with the past, sleep undisturbed" (page 15). This is the third time he has taken St. Francis de Sales as his subject.

This time he "endeavors to portray the aspect of St. Francis de Sales' character that is most readily grasped by the average reader" (Introduction, page ix). "I am not a hagiographer . . . The quality in St. Francis de Sales that I wish both to describe and extol is his *coeur de chair*" (page 22). His endeavor is crowned with success, gauged by the unhesitating recommendation of his book by those who know St. Francis de Sales.

Books II and III dealing with "Love in Marriage" and "Women of the World", respectively, will be of unquestionable value and interest and entertainment to those concerned. In fact, these "books" should be published as separate brochures by some willing Salesian propagandist. Their historical accuracy is unimpeached, their practicalness best expressed by the author's own impression: "The spiritual advice of St. Francis de Sales has not lost its validity with the passing of time . . . We need not fear that the teachings of St. Francis de Sales will seem out of date" (pages 89-90).

Twenty years ago three Roman professors of the Apollinare, Tabarelli (since dead), Vizzini (now Bishop of Nola), and Palica (now Vice-Gerent of Rome), gave to the reviewer oral assurances of their same conviction about St. Francis de Sales' profound understanding and analysis of the human heart. Said Msgr. Vizzini: "St. Francis de Sales is the first great spiritual director to have mastered the psychology of woman." Henri Bordeaux' present volume is a clear demonstration of this statement: "The gradual perfectioning of

women throughout the past three centuries can in part be traced to the influence of St. Francis de Sales" (page 147).

The young girl, the married woman, the widow, will be "reached" by Books II and III, the perusal of which will result in an answer to the author's prayer: "Will you not, then, lift the burdens from the shoulders of innumerable weak, nervous, delicate women who render their lives one long torture by their scruples and worries, lives which, today, are far more painful than in past centuries because of economic conditions?" Women in religion, though certain to profit by the whole volume, will find in Book IV, "St. Francis de Sales and the Life of the Spirit", one of the most beautiful exposes of the mystical life yet offered them. At the same time, throughout these pages it is ever evident that "his teaching is as closely linked with experience as our flesh is knitted to our bones" (page 56).

In this book several controversial points are touched upon. Among them of particular significance to the reviewer is Bordeaux' conclusion on St. Francis de Sales versus the Quietism of Mme. Guyon: "But not the slightest trace of this taint can be detected in St. Francis de Sales" (page 278) . . . "There is no spiritual director more firm, more vigorous or more exacting than St. Francis de Sales, though on the exterior he is all courtesy and grace" (page 5).

The reviewer's appreciation of Henri Bordeaux' volume as a whole is perhaps best expressed in this way: It is like a great producer staging the theme of a great playwright. Like a David Belasco presenting a work of Shakespeare. The book is replete with the beautiful way in which Bordeaux interprets St. Francis de Sales' thoughts and translates them into words of his own. Like glossaries alongside of an original text, the paraphrases of Bordeaux make the reading even more enchanting.

This is particularly true of Book I, wherein his descriptions of Savoy become pen-pictures worthy of a great artist, and all leading to this estimate: "All the peace of the Savoy countryside is to be found in St. Francis de Sales" (page 21). His three pages (29, 30, 31) on "the kitchen" form an essay for which certain American periodicals would enhance their value by publication.

After reading the volume, one is brought to the author's own conclusions: "Nothing is duller than these fulsome biographies which seek only to be edifying and which end by being merely unconvincing" (page 26), and: "How far removed we are from the insipid St.

Francis de Sales depicted by so many of his commentators" (page 275).

Sister Benita's translation retains all the charm of the original. There are several mistakes of grammar and spelling which in the copy sent to the reviewer were corrected with ink, showing that they will not appear in the following editions, which surely will be many.

J. F. TUCKER, O. S. F. S.

Joan of Arc. By HILAIRE BELLOC. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1929. Pp. 128. $1.75.)

The Maid of France has long been a favorite subject for writers, no matter what their religious belief or lack of belief. Here the chief events of her career are related by a famous Catholic historian and story-teller, in the simple style of legendary narrative, for the ears of children. Though writing for this audience, Mr. Belloc has taken pains to mention the absence of certain historical records of her case, and the possible reasons for it. No great mystery surrounds Joan in his presentation. Her youth and inexperience, as depicted here, serve only to enhance her courage, her obedience to her Voices, and her insistence upon the supernatural signs of her mission. Young people will have no difficulty in understanding the terms in which the obstacles in her path, the timidity, indifference, and perfidy of the Dauphin's counsellors, the economic and military weakness of France, and the conduct of the Bishop of Beauvais are explained. The final chapter records her trial and death, after her Voices no longer led her. If read aloud before a winter fireside, this book will hold entranced attention.

ELIZABETH M. LYNSKEY.

A History of the League or Sainte Union 1576-1595. By MAURICE WILKINSON, M. A. (Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie and Co. 1929. Pp. xi, 223.)

This is the first attempt in English to give a survey of the history of the famous League, which, despite its apparent indecisiveness and its petty intrigues, impressed its purposes on the course of political events in France and made itself felt in the religious history of

Europe. The author approaches the subject from its political side; and while paying due attention to its religious significance, succeeds in unravelling the mass of intrigue with which its aims were obscured and in bringing coherence into a web of events which usually appear unrelated and fruitless. To have succeeded in coordinating the passions, political and religious, which were rending every country in Europe into a program of progress and reform was a task as difficult as that of following the course of events which led in France to the suppression of Calvinism and the triumph of Catholicism. Here order is elicited from the chaos and it is possible to form an estimate of the forces which resulted in the triumph of the League. The keynote to the author's purpose is found in his conviction that the so-called Wars of Religion were predominantly political. "It is important to remember", he says, "that the Huguenots, in the intention of the Court, were not slaughtered as enemies of the Church any more than our English Catholics were offered up to the outraged majesty of Elizabeth's church, but because they were insuperably in the way of the political schemes of the councils. England's policy took no more account of the moral values than Catherine's."

The wavering policy of the Valois rulers was, no doubt, the main reason for the organization of the League, but the outcome of its activities which resulted in the accession of a Huguenot and Bourbon cannot be taken as the measure of its services to France. In the first place the League in defence of its attitude of hostility to the policies of the sons of Catherine was forced into the promulgation of a political philosophy which, though it did not become effective until the nineteenth century, remained a considerable influence in subsequent French political thought, and, in the second place, the implacable determination of the members of the League to test the principle of majority rule, prevented the enforcement of the baneful doctrine that the ruler could dictate the religious beliefs of his subjects. Absolutism revived, it is true, under Louis XIV, but the lessen of toleration was not entirely lost.

More than in most works dealing with this period the author lays stress on the close connection which existed between the course of political events in France and in England. Both had an enemy and rival in Spain, and, though irreconcilably divided on the subject of religion, they never lost sight of their common purpose to humble that rival. The work might have been extended indefinitely. The materials were abundant, but the author is to be congratulated in

having refrained from any protracted discussion of the mediocrities who directed the affairs of France at the time. He has succeeded in presenting his subject in a more significant fashion by calling attention to the political principles which were invoked and involved. His preoccupation with the political phases of the subject has caused him to relegate religion to a secondary place. It may be, however, that the impartiality with which he dispenses praise and blame to all churches and creeds may be an indication that he looks on religion as having been, at that time at least, a mere pawn and pretence in the hands of politicians.

P. J. H.

The Sisters of Saint Francis of the Holy Family. By SISTER MARY CORTONA GLODEN. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1928. Pp. xxi, 278.)

Sixty-five years ago in the predominantly Protestant city of Herford, Rhenish Prussia, three heroic young women commenced a little teaching community of nuns; today that community, entirely transplanted to America and numbering almost seven hundred members, maintains its numerous flourishing missions from the shores of Lake Michigan and the banks of the Mississippi to the Pacific slope. The above captioned volume recounts simply and directly the little more than three score years' history of the order, and on its perusal the reader will ask himself if in modern annals any other religious order in so few years has passed through such poignant romance and such sharp vicissitudes.

In 1864, Josephine Termehr, a native of Essen in the Ruhr valley, commenced the foundation of the order in Herford with the wholehearted approval of Bishop Conrad Martin of Paderborn. She had previously been a member of the Sisters of the Holy Cross at Strassburg; but with the permission of her superiors and the approbation of her bishop she launched the independent mother-house of the new order in Herford. She was further impelled toward this venture because of the rumblings of impending warfare due to the national jealousies of France and Germany which had penetrated behind the convent walls and where the German members of this French community were treated with "scant sympathy". Two other young women who had been postulants of the Strassburg convent and had

just been dismissed because of their German parentage, joined her at Herford in the new endeavor.

The community grew and prospered, and its activities embraced teaching, nursing, and caring for the orphans. With the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War in 1866, the sisters volunteered as war nurses and did heroic work; so heroic indeed, that in 1870, at the commencement of the hostilities of the Franco-Prussian War, the services of the young community were again urgently requested by the government. The nuns established their lazarettes behind the embattled lines in France, and two members paid the supreme sacrifice for their country. Some time after the conclusion of the war, the imperial Iron Cross of the first-class was presented to the sisters in recognition of their distinguished service during the conflict, and a letter of gratitude was written by the Empress Augusta to Mother Xavier (Josephine Termehr).

Shortlived was the gratitude of the Empire. The May Laws of 1873, the persecutions of the Iron Chancellor during the *Kulturkampf*, and the little community found itself facing the alternative of disbanding or going into exile. They decided on the latter. Their bishop, then a prisoner in the fortress of Wesel, sent a letter with the sisters to Bishop John Hennessy of Dubuque, Iowa. The latter and his priests received them with great kindness when they arrived at Iowa City. A few years later they established their mother-house at Dubuque.

The book describes graphically the remarkable growth of this one time tiny community of exiles during the little more than a half century which has since elapsed. A hospital, a home for the aged, orphans' homes, working girls' homes, and numerous schools and academies dot the West from Chicago to Portland, Oregon. The volume is a valuable and interesting contribution to the history of the Church in the Northwest.

M. M. HOFFMANN.

Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen. By ERICH STANGE. (Leipzig: Felix Meiner. 1927.)

To the collection *Die Wissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen* belongs this interesting volume on the scholarship of a group of Catholic churchmen of the present day in the form of autobiographies. Seven of the most prominent scholars in the field of

Catholic theology in Germany were chosen by the editors: Bernhard Bartmann (dogmatic theology); Hartmann Grisar, S. J. (the great Luther scholar); Joseph Mausbach (moral theology); Norbert Peters (scripture); Franz Sawicki (philosophy); Joseph Schmidlin (missionary science); and Heinrich Schrörs (Church history). Each one describes in a thorough but brief study his advance in the realm of scholarship and his contributions to his respective field. The beginner will find inspiration in this volume; and the retiring professor will read it and possibly draw a favorable, or as the case may be, unfavorable, parallel to his own career. These autobiographies are charming revelations of the lives of scholars whose fame has passed far beyond their native land. Each biography is followed by a list of writings and publications, and the compilation, no doubt, will prove to be a valuable source of information to the specialist.

L. B.

Missions and Missionaries of California. By CHARLES ANTHONY ENGELHARDT, in religion FR. ZEPHYRIN, O. F. M. Vol. I. *Lower California.* (Mission Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, Calif.: the Author. 1929. 2d Ed. Pp. xxxiii, 784.)

It is twenty years since *Missions and Missionaries of California* appeared in the first edition. Its appearance was opportune. Studies in Hispanic-American history were finding their way into print; moreover an awakened public interest created a demand for poetry, romance, and history for the general reader. Unfortunately the activities of the California missionaries had never been justly or adequately treated, either because of failure to secure reliable material which would have furnished the facts, or because of an inability on the part of the writers to appreciate the ideals and motives which actuated the Spanish missionary pioneers. Father Engelhardt's work was sorely needed. It was unbiased; it was scholarly; it was reliable for it was compiled from source material drawn from mission records and ecclesiastical documents unknown or inaccessible to previous writers. Needless to say no bibliography treating any phase of the history of the Southwest borderlands is complete without a mention of the works of Father Engelhardt on the California missions.

The preface of the first edition stated that this volume was to serve as an introduction for the story of the missions of Upper California.

The implied promise has been nobly fulfilled; three large volumes tell the story of the upper peninsula. These were followed by seven smaller volumes varying in size from 190 to 450 pages which formed a new series—the local history of the individual missions. The first volume which treated of the missions of Lower California is now presented in a second edition. But it is in no sense a reprint, although that in itself would have answered a demand of some years standing. The increased interest in this phase of the history of our country manifested by scholars has resulted in the discovery of some important documents. This together with the publication of several careful and reliable books by recent writers induced the author to revise some portions of the first volume and augment others. The second edition then is practically a new work.

As in the previous edition the subject-matter is organized into four large units: the Introduction; the Jesuit Period; the Franciscan Period; and the Dominican Period. The expansion of the introductory chapters became possible and advisable after the publication of the diaries of Cabrillo and Vicaino in Professor Bolton's *Spanish Explorations in the Southwest* (1916). In some instances the author of the *Missions and Missionaries,* although himself convinced of the correctness of certain of his conclusions, did not have at hand the facts which would warrant an unqualified statement. A case in point is the identity of the first Vicar-Apostolic of the New World. Whereas in the first edition the author declares it his belief that the ecclesiastic in question was a Minim, not a Friar Minor, in the later edition he can summon to his aid the opinion of one who has become an authority on Columbus and Columbian expeditions. Reverend Father Angel Ortega, O. F. M., in his *La Rabida, Historia Documental Critica* (1925-26) designates Very Reverend Fr. Bernardo Buil, a member of the *Minims of St. Francis of Paula,* as the Vicar Apostolic who accompanied the discoverer on his second voyage. Another illustration of changes dependent upon the findings of recent investigators may be cited. Following the commonly accepted tradition, the author had given to Sir Francis Drake credit for the discovery of San Francisco Bay; in the revision the claims of Drake's admirers are set aside and the arguments of H. E. Wagner accepted, viz., that the credit of the achievement belongs to Captain Sevastian Cermeño, who, accompanied by Fr. Francisco de la Conception, entered the bay and took possession November 6, 1596.

In the revision of the Jesuit Period the greatest changes are noted

in Chapter IV. In referring to the Memorial of Rev. Francisco Maria Piccolo, the author points out that the version found in Bolton's *Kino* has been substituted for that taken from the *Cartas Edificantes* which had been used in the previous edition. The Franciscan Period has undergone fewest alterations. The changes for the most part are in the line of reorganization by which a better distribution of matter has been secured. The discovery of the rock used as a boundary marker by Father Palou was made in 1926. This interesting fact is discussed in Appendix N. A photograph of the marker and a sketch map showing the boundary between the Dominican and Franciscan missions have been incorporated in the text. The most drastic revision is apparent in the fourth section, which deals with the Dominican missions. Chapters have been so expanded that two or three are necessary to take care of the material formerly comprised within a single one. Four entire chapters have been added to bring the story to the present time. The material for these has been furnished by the archives of the Archbishop of San Francisco and by the archives of the Santa Barbara Mission.

In matters of form there has been a great improvement in this new edition. Illustrations, diagrams and maps are more numerous. It would have added to the value of these illustrations had the accompanying legends in all cases carried some indication of the sources. There has been an addition of interesting items in the appendix: "Indian Morality", "Plant Productions of the Missions", "A Valuable Historical Document" (a memorandum made by Fr. Serra) are some of the articles. The table of contents and the index leave nothing to be desired. A few typographical errors have crept in, for instance, in the *Historical Authorities,* G. W. Hendry's contributions are dated 1825 and 1826 for 1925 and 1926, respectively. It is to be regretted that in the Bibliography there is no difference in font to distinguish printed from unprinted sources. These are but minor defects and hardly worthy of mention, in view of the extremely valuable contribution which is here made to the history of Nation and of Church in the Spanish southwest.

SISTER MARY CELESTE.

Juan María de Salvatierra of the Company of Jesus; Missionary in the Province of New Spain, and Apostolic Conqueror of the Californias. By MIGUEL VENEGAS. Translated into English: Edited and Annotated by MARGUERITE EYER WILBUR. [*Spain in the West.* A Series of Original Documents from Foreign Archives. Volume V.] (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1929. Pp. ix, 350. $6.)

Students of Hispanic-American history will welcome this new volume of *Spain in the West,* the fifth of the series. It is an annotated translation of what Father Miguel Venegas, S. J., published in Mexico in 1754 under the title *El Apóstol Mariano representado en la vida del V. P. Juan María de Salvatierra.* The fact that this work in the original Spanish is now very rare lends the present translation special value, being a translation of the copy preserved in the Los Angeles Public Library.

Juan de Salvatierra occupies a distinguished place in the annals of the Jesuit missions that once flourished in what is to-day Lower California. By his pioneer enterprises and achievements and by his dauntless zeal and indefatigable labors for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the Indians he deserves to be styled the Apostle of Lower California, just as for the same reason his confrère and friend, Father Eusebio Kino, S. J., has merited the title of Apostle of Arizona. Both were men of lofty ideals, sterling virtue, and unbounded energy—men whose career and activity should be more generally known to students of Catholic American history. The present biography of Salvatierra furnishes for the mission history of Lower California what Dr. Bolton's critical edition of *Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimeria Alta,* likewise a publication of the *Spain in the West* Series, provides for the mission history of Arizona. Both tell the story of the beginnings of the Church in those regions—a story of generous aspirations, frequent disappointments, annoying obstacles, undying zeal, heroic sacrifices, and ultimate triumph.

The excellent "Historical Introduction" (pp. 21-45) in the work under review sketches the attempts of the Spaniards to explore and colonize the peninsula of Lower California, from the exploits of Hernando Cortés in 1533 to the final establishment of Mission Loreto by Salvatierra in 1697. It is a fascinating account presented in a fascinating way, well suited to prepare the reader for the story of Salva-

tierra's interesting and edifying career as missionary and explorer. In view of what is stated on page 32, it may be well to point out here that the Franciscans conducted the Lower California missions for only about five years and that the first Jesuits came to Mexico in 1572. Then, on page 36, the year 1767 is probably a typographical error and must read 1769. It was in the latter year that the Franciscans under Father Junípero Serra founded Mission San Diego in what is now the State of California.

It goes without saying that the missionary career of Salvatierra, as presented in this biography of Venegas, is highly edifying and that the numerous anecdotes woven into the narrative are intensely interesting. When reading the narrative, however, one must bear in mind that it was written in large measure for edification, although this circumstance does not make the biography less valuable as a source of information for the more critically minded historian.

As to the translation itself, it is well done, so well indeed that for the most part the reader will scarcely detect the fact of its being a translation. At times, however, the original Spanish was followed too literally, whereby clearness was sacrificed, while occasionally English terms of expression are employed that point to insufficient acquaintance with Catholic terminology. Thus "Vaticum" (p. 70), evidently a misprint for "Viaticum", denotes in its non-liturgical sense (as employed here) "provisions for a journey." The English equivalent for the Spanish idiom "The Holy Sacrifice with mass" (p. 92) is "The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass". By "frequent attendance at the Holy Sacrament" (p. 100) Venegas doubtlessly meant the reception of Holy Communion or attendance at Holy Mass. On page 116 (note 30) "charity" must evidently be "chastity", and vice versa on page 303 "chastity" must be "charity". In Spanish the term "Corpus" (p. 188) stands for the feast of Corpus Christi. "Ave Maria Stella" (pp. 219, 224) must be "Ave Maris Stella". By "Prelates of the Holy Orders" (p. 220) superiors of religious orders are meant. "By means of the viaticum" (p. 223) can mean only that Salvatierra received Holy Communion "by way of" (*por medio de*) the Viaticum. The correct English term is "birettas", not "bonnets" (p. 229). Similarly, the term "lawyers" (p. 253), probably for the Spanish *abogados*, will not be taken to mean intercessors or mediators, the only meaning the term can have in this connection. These faulty renditions and typographical errors are pointed

out because the reviewer hopes they will be welcomed by those who possess a copy of this work and also by the publishers in the event of a second edition of it; for in every other respect the work deserves high praise and commendation and should find a place in the shelves of every student of Hispanic-American history.

Needless to add, the general make-up of the volume together with the fine portraits, missions pictures, and maps which it embodies, is in keeping with some of the best we have from the Arthur H. Clark Company in the art of modern book-making. The publishers as well as the translator are to be congratulated on this beautiful and valuable biography of one of our great Spanish missionaries.

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK, O. F. M.

Die Kongregation De Propaganda Fide und ihre Taetigkeit in Nord-Amerika. By Rev. R. CORRIGAN, S. J., Ph. D. (Munich: Joergen. 1928. Pp. 183.)

For nearly three centuries (1634-1908), the Church in the United States was under the supreme jurisdiction of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide. Great names are included in the list of Cardinals-Prefect who governed the American Church from the days when the Calvert Pilgrims sailed for Maryland to the time when by the action of Pope Pius X, we ceased to be a Church with missionary status and were brought under the direct control of the Holy See itself—Barberini, Sacripanti, Spinelli, Antonelli, Borgia, Fontana, Consalvi, Franzoni, Barnabò, Franchi, Simeoni and Gotti. These eminent ecclesiastics and statesmen are so identified with the growth and development of Church discipline in the United States that their names are inseparably linked with our history. From the historical viewpoint, it is unfortunate that the regulations governing the use of state archives in Europe must postpone the day when all that Propaganda has done for the Church in the United States can be told from the documents in the famous archives, now housed in its present headquarters in the Piazza di Spagna.

Some years ago the reviewer spent several months in European libraries in an effort to collect a complete bibliography of the works dealing with Propaganda and the results were published in this REVIEW (Vol. VI, pp. 478-494). No country in the world owes so much to Propaganda's influence and guidance as the United States,

and there was considerable interest aroused in 1921-1922 when it was announced that the officials of the Congregation were contemplating a general tercentenary history of Propaganda (1622-1922). There was also under advisement the founding of a quarterly historical review for the purpose of creating international interest in the Congregation. The *Terzo Centenario della Sacra Congregazione de Propaganda Fide* (pp. 48) commemorating the event was a popular account; hardly anything worthy of the anniversary was produced.

The works which already exist on the subject are few, and are written mainly for other lands than our own. Professor Fish's *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and Italian Archives* (1911) gives an insight into the rich collections of the Propaganda Archives and opens a splendid vista to the historical past of this great Roman missionary organization; but evidently years must pass before the entire story of these three centuries will be written.

This fact, apart from its intrinsic scholarly merit, heightens the value of Dr. Corrigan's doctoral dissertation (Munich, 1928) on the work of the Sacred Congregation in North America during the seventeenth century. The creation of the congregation was contemporary with the establishment of the first European colonies in North America, and the author describes in detail the work of Propaganda in Canada, the West Indies (Antilles), and in Maryland. His Introduction contains a survey of the printed and unprinted material for Propaganda's history and supplements to a large extent the excellent introduction in Professor Fish's *Guide*. A complete bibliography of works on the missions under the jurisdiction of Propaganda, as Dr. Corrigan says, is not necessary, since the list compiled by Father Streit in his *Bibliotheica Missionum*, Vol. III, *Amerikanische Missionsliteratur* (Aachen, 1927), admirably fulfils this purpose.

It would be easy, Dr. Corrigan writes, to present a whole litany of appreciations from the friends and enemies of the Catholic Church of the splendid career of those who directed the work of Propaganda in spreading the Gospel and in bringing the missionary activities in the New World into direct contact with the noble spirit which characterized the leaders of the Counter-Reform movement. The Sacred Congregation brought new vigor, new methods and above all a new spirit into the missionary field. Probably of supreme moment in its history is the fact that Propaganda freed missionary activity in the New World from State control and brought it under the direction to

which it belonged—the Holy See. Every historian of the United States is in sympathy with the wish cited by Dr. Corrigan—"Moechte doch die Propaganda ein Historiker von der Grosse eines Ludwig von Pastor erstehen!"

With its truly magnificent past in the Cause of Christ, the history of Propaganda should be told in all that wealth of detail which its immense archival resources permit. Trede's ironic question—"Ist Sie doch ein Institut welches nicht von sich spricht?"—could then be answered in a series of works which would command the attention of the world's best historians. Dr. Corrígan's volume, though brief, has pointed the way.

P. G.

A History of Latin America. By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. (New York: Abingdon Press. 1929. Pp. 404.)

Histoire de l'Amérique Espagnole. Par JEAN TOUSSAINT BERTRAND. Prefaced by M. VICTOR A. BELAUNDE. Two volumes. (Paris: Edition Spes. 1929. Pp. 453; 469.)

Hispanic-American History: Syllabus. By WILLIAM W. PIERSON, JR. (University of North Carolina Press. Pp. 169.)

Latin-America: its Rise and Progress. By F. GARCIA CALDERSON. (London: T. Unwin Fisher. 1926. Pp. 406.)

Here are four works on Latin America, the first three historical, the last largely descriptive and expository. Dr. Sweet's production is one of those many attempts at compressing within the limits of a single handy volume the history of more than a continent from the coming of the Spaniards and the Portuguese to the present day, and the best we can say of it is that it is open to no stronger objections than those that may be brought against similar efforts. The present reviewer has arrived at the conclusion that such a method is unsound for the reason that "Latin America" is not a single political entity but a congeries of independent states differing from one another at least as much as Spain differs from France. In the first place, Brazil is quite distinct from the Spanish-speaking countries, and in the second place even those republics which were once under Spain have since independence pursued their several ways until by now they can no more be lumped together than Canada and the United States. Well-meaning North Americans sometimes offend their Latin neighbours by neglecting this

point and speaking of "South America" as though that vast continent were about as small and as homogeneous as the state of Delaware. It is not enough for the writer of a book to recognize the fact and admit it explicitly; to treat all these nations in one volume and call that volume "A History of Latin America" is misleading and certain to get the subject out of focus. Moreover, he is obliged to treat the nations, after independence, under separate headings, with the result that the reader is confronted with a mass of unrelated information whereof he retains little or nothing.

This stricture applies even more strongly to attempts at estimating social or economic conditions among the Latin American peoples as though it were possible to make general statements that would apply from the Rio Grande to Tierra del Fuego. Here is an instance: "The young men of South America . . . have no athletics, games, or even business, to occupy their attention" (p. 313). This is true of some parts of that large continent, absurdly false of others, as a week in Buenos Aires will suffice to show. One such sweeping statement is enough to impair confidence in a historian.

But there is a more serious defect in Dr. Sweet's book. He suffers, as do so many North Americans, from an inability to penetrate the Latin temperament. It takes a person with a strong sympathetic insight into Mediterranean culture to understand these people. That is almost equivalent to saying that only a Catholic may hope to understand them, and such a claim would be but a slight exaggeration. Learning, travel, and years of residence will do much, but they will not of themselves enable a student to plumb the depths of Latin America. For that is required the Catholic point of view, something that Dr. Sweet evidently lacks. I do not wish to suggest that he is prejudiced or unfair, but only record an impression gained from the book that the author does not get far enough below the surface. This would seem to be the reason that the part played by the clergy in the struggles for independence is not adequately presented. For instance, not a hint is given of the striking fact, possibly unique in history, that at the Congress of Tucumán (1816) the clergy outnumbered the laity. Mitre's brief but pregnant comment on this in his *Historia de la República Argentina* may be commended to those North Americans who seem to have little notion of the Church's historic position in the lands to the south of them.

The reading references appended to the chapters, while they have

a certain "practical" value, are too predominantly of books in English, and not always the most authoritative books at that. For instance (to take another random example), the best biographies of Belgrane, that of his great-grandson Marie Belgrane and that of General Mitre, are not found in the list on pages 181-182. If it be replied that such works are beyond the capacity of the average North American college student we can only rejoin that if that is so the average North American college student had better keep clear of Latin American history altogether. For that sea is only for the lusty swimmer, not for one content to wade timidly in the shallows.

The volumes of M. Bertrand are in quite a different class. From beginning to end his work manifests not only scholarship but a quality finer than scholarship, a quality more delicate and more subtle, viz., a sense of fellowship with the people he is treating of. Being a Frenchman and a Catholic he is heir to the same culture as that which is rooted in South America. Hence while there is no attempt at whitewashing, no effort to condone abuses in Church or in State, there is that sympathy with his subject that is an indispensable requisite to a historian. Moreover he deals only with the Spanish lands, thus wisely limiting his subject by leaving out Brazil (except incidentally). Again, the division of the work into two volumes goes far, though it does not go the whole way, toward enabling him to avoid the pitfall spoken of above, that namely of false grouping of independent nations as though they were all somehow united. For the division comes at the end of the colonial period, so that the treatment of the modern republics is separated from that of the colonies. But even then, the treatment in one volume of so many diverse political entities, though very well done, is not entirely successful. It might have been better to follow the example of Lamarca and stop after the wars for independence, unless he was prepared to follow the example of Pereyra and turn out eight volumes or so. It is necessary to choose one method or the other: there is no middle path. Allowing for this we do not hesitate to pronounce M. Bertrand's book the best of its kind we have seen. If translated into English it might free us from those multitudinous "Histories of South America" which can be commended for little beyond their good intentions.

The treatment of pre-Columbian America is thorough and accurate, his guide here being chiefly d'Harcourt's *L'Amérique avant Colombe*; for the colonial era he follows largely Pereyra. But his acquaintance

with the literature is comprehensive and his judgments original. We would single out for special mention the following excellencies: a fair and adequate exposition of the rôle of the Church in Latin American history, especially in the missions and in the wars for independence; the brief but perfectly clear biographies prefixed to many of the chapters; the maps and the illustrations; the bibliographies, which mention only works that are standard and indispensable. But the salient virtue of these volumes is their blending of sympathy with detachment, a characteristic, one may almost say, of the French historical school. While by temperament, by training and by long residence he is fitted to understand the Latin American, he has not suffered this understanding to degenerate into partiality but has succeeded in producing throughout an impression of dispassionateness. He has applied to the whole history of the Spanish Americans the principle laid down by Bolivár for the guidance of the historian of revolutions: to study the subject at close range and judge it from a distance.

But with praise must be mingled a note of adverse criticism. M. Bertrand seems impressed with the notion of "Yankee Imperialism" to such an extent that some portions of the work read like propaganda. The mode of presentation frequently puts the North American on the defensive and therefore little inclined to give M. Bertrand a fair hearing. M. Bertrand has an unfortunate penchant for calling the people of the United States "Yankees". At least this is bad taste; at most it is reprehensible as being not only alien to the true historical spirit but also likely to obstruct the efforts of those many persons who whether in the northern continent or in the southern are striving earnestly to promote good will between the United States and Latin America. Like sensitive persons generally, the Latins sometimes forget that others have feelings as well as themselves.

Dr. Pierson's *Syllabus* is so well and so favourably known that little beyond the bare mention of this new edition is needed. Some changes, all of them improvements, have been introduced, the one that will naturally strike the reader first being the extension of the bibliographies. These are complete and at the same time reasonably brief. That many teachers have successfully used the work as a basis for lectures is a sufficient recommendation.

The volume of Sr. García Calderón is in a different category from those we have just reviewed. While based on history and replete with

facts its value lies rather in vivid presentation and keen analysis. If asked for a comparison we should classify it with Barry's *Papal Monarchy,* which it resembles not in method only but somewhat in style as well. To writing of this kind the objection has been made that it is "viewy"; but views have a place and interpretation is certainly one of the historian's functions. Naked fact undraped in interpretation is not history but only the material of history; the sole requirement is that the subjective and the objective elements be not confused. These remarks are not superfluous, for "the serious student" is a little too ready to pass over works like the present under the impression that they are journalistic rather then scholarly. To treat Sr. García Calderón's *Latin America* that way would be regrettable, his training and his diplomatic experience having combined to elevate him above the stratum of the propagandist or the impressionist.

The North American may by this work be brought to realize more intensely two important facts: (1) For more than a century Europeans have been following far more closely than have the people of the United States the trend of events in South America; (2) Some of the deeds of the United States (the liberation of Cuba, for instance) supposed by people of that country to be shining examples of disinterestedness are taken differently by South Americans. In this connection the third and the fourth chapters of Book VI and the concluding chapter of Book VII merit careful study.

EDWIN RYAN.

American History. By SAMUEL KNOX WILSON, S. J., Professor of History in Loyola University. (Chicago: Loyola University Press. 1929. Pp. xv, 864.)

This volume presents a general survey of American history in twenty-seven chapters. The first chapter is an introduction to the European background of American history. It traces briefly the development of Europe beginning with the Greek Empire, onward through the Roman Empire, the "Barbarian Invasions", feudalism, the Crusades, the Renaissance, rise of nationalism, the Reformation, the origin of parliamentary government in England and the commercial revolution of the sixteenth century. The author then traces the rise of the Spanish, French, and British empires in the New

World. Three chapters are devoted to the social, economic and political life of the thirteen British colonies in North America. The next four chapters contain a study of the relations between the colonies and England, the causes of the American Revolution, and the winning of independence. A large section of the volume is concerned with the rise of American nationality and the beginnings of the United States under the Constitution. The remaining chapters are concerned with the period since the Civil War, emphasizing post-war reconstruction, expansion and reform.

Summarized in another way, the period of American history from 1492 to 1783 is covered in eight chapters, 234 pages; the period from the Peace of Paris, 1783, to the close of the Civil War, nine chapters, 269 pages; the period since the Civil War, nine chapters, 279 pages. From this summary it is evident that the book is well balanced both in content and arrangement. No phase or event is treated at such length as to limit the space given to others of equal importance.

Father Wilson's manual is intended for the use of high-school students in their third or fourth year, and he has been successful in presenting his subject in a suitable manner for such students. He has omitted all but the important and essential dates, and eliminated insignificant or irrelevant facts, complicated military campaigns and intricate political movements. All events are described with as much pictorial detail as space permits. For these reasons the book will prove of interest to the general reader as well as the high-school student.

The author has placed particular emphasis on colonial history, the establishment of our government and the development of American nationality. Most high-school textbooks in American history place too much emphasis on the period after the Civil War. The study of this period is too difficult not only for the high-school student but also for the average college freshman. To appreciate the history of this period it is necessary to have not only a general knowledge of the activities of statesmen and politicians, but also of political science and the general principles of the Constitution, finance, and banking, both in theory and practice, railroads, corporations and a rudimentary knowledge of economics. The history of the United States to the Civil War is largely political; since the Civil War the history of the United States is the history of the development of economic policies, both national and international. In view of this fact the history of

the past sixty-five years is too difficult even for the average college student in his first and second year.

The entire book is made attractive by the quality of its paper, the size of type and the arrangement of its contents. There are numerous illustrations, maps and plates, as well as cartoons characteristic of the times. At the end of each chapter there is a list of books for supplementary reading for the student and more intensive study for the general reader. There is a list of illustrations and a carefully prepared index. Because of all these excellent qualities the volume should prove popular among all teachers of American history in the high schools of the country.

HERBERT W. RICE.

L'Enfant and Washington, 1791-1792: Published and Unpublished Documents Now Brought Together for the First Time. By ELIZABETH S. KITE. Introduction by J. J. Jusserand, Ambassador of France to the United States, 1902-1925. Foreword by Charles Moore, Chairman, National Commission of Fine Arts. [Historical Documents, Institut Français de Washington, Cahier III.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1929. Pp. xi, 182.)

L'Enfantiana as history and literature has been materially enriched through Miss Kite's documentary story of the French engineer's official association with the establishment of the Federal City, 1791-1792. Drawn from every acceptable and authentic source with keen appreciation of historic balance, this volume is the first devoted exclusively to Pierre Charles L'Enfant, creator of the ground plan on which the Capital City has been erected. It is arranged in chronological sequence with illuminating threads of comment bridging spaces as to time and clarity. Of unique value is the foreword by Charles Moore, chairman of the Fine Arts Commission—charged with the heroic task of restoring L'Enfant's design in its original integrity, which speaks with reverence of the genius who conceived it and with finality as to the compulsion of its slightest details.

It was a happy thought on which Miss Kite is to be cordially commended to present M. Jusserand's essay, "L'Enfant and the Federal City" as an introduction to her admirable compilation from the national archives. Her relation is necessarily confined to the official connection of the brilliant and erratic artist with the founding of the

august patriot's name city on the banks of the Potomac. The chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, always a modest scholar, has written briefly and with the definite purpose of showing the magnificence of L'Enfant's plan and the obligation under which the government had always rested to restore its author to the place in the national esteem which his services so obviously merited. M. Jusserand's essay has been regarded as the masterpiece of the literature which for the past century has been gathering around the French engineer, and in its pages the complete man is for the first time presented, from his birth in Paris, August 2nd, 1754, to his death at Green Hill Manor on September 23, 1825.

For ten years before writing "L'Enfant and the Federal City", one of the essays composing the volume, *With Americans of Past and Present Times*, the versatile and scholarly ambassador from the French Republic had devoted all available leisure to this study of the unfortunate Frenchman who had bestowed so superb a gift on the young nation of his adoption. M. Jusserand had been inspired in the first instance by the unselfish loyalty of James Dudley Morgan, president of the Columbia Historical Society, to the cause of justice for L'Enfant. Dr. Morgan's arguments had been subsequently supported staunchly by his associates, Glenn Brown, author of *The United States Capital*; W. B. Bryan, of *The History of the National Capital*; William Tindall, *The Capital City*, and Hugh R. Taggart, who had collected an invaluable assortment of manuscripts, second in importance only to that which L'Enfant's accepted champion, James Dudley Morgan, bequeathed to the Library of Congress. The initial results of the ambassador's examinations of the French War Office and Parisian records, together with some reproductions of the elder Pierre L'Enfant's paintings, had appeared in the Washington press, and excellent framed photos of the paintings may be admired in the office of the District Commissioners, the gift of M. Jusserand.

It was not long then before the French ambassador and in a greater measure Dr. Morgan realized that the end of the long painful road leading to L'Enfant's vindication was approaching. But although national honor for the founder of Washington's ground plan "had been in the air" for a quarter of a century, the direct cause of the removal from the forgotten grave at Green Hill, the stately cortege to the rotunda of the Capitol, the reinterment in Arlington Cemetery, has an interesting and most intimate connection with the Catholic

University. The late Bishop of Richmond, Most Rev. Dennis J. O'Connell, then rector of the papal seat of learning, visiting the old home of William Dudley Digges, grandfather of Dr. Morgan, was moved with indignation by the neglected grave. He despatched a letter to Henry B. F. MacFarland, chairman of the Board of District of Columbia Commissioners, saying that since it was apparent that neither the city nor the Federal governments would undertake the proper care of the eminent engineer's resting place, could he have the remains removed to the grounds of the Catholic University and placed in a worthy mausoleum? There followed an acrimonious controversy between all the factors involved. District officials, members of the Senate and House, historians, engineers, architects and artists combined in a concentrated effort. But the Park Commission, predecessor of the Fine Arts Commission, had in 1902 rendered a report on the restoration of L'Enfant's plan for the Federal City which proved the mightiest lever in lifting all movements for honoring him into eventual success. Congress appropriated $1,000, a niggardly sum reminiscent of the reward, $300, offered the engineer for his incomparable creation. But such was the national temper that $100 would have sufficed. The engineer corps in which the gallant Major had served during the War of Independence was proud to remove the body and arrange all details of the reinterment without compensation. But a few dollars were expended on the splendid ceremonial of April 28, 1909, and the remaining sum was reserved to form a nucleus for a suitable monument. Immediately former students of L'École des Beaux Arts in Paris volunteered to furnish the design and the sculptor, and the money was expended for materials and imperative minor expenses. This granite shaft, unveiled on May 22, 1911, by Dr. Morgan's daughter, Eleanor Carroll Morgan, is not a great piece of art as memorials go, but it was a fine gesture of appreciation. M. Jusserand had eloquently proclaimed that L'Enfant had built his own monument across the Potomac and in full view of his last resting place, the fair city of Washington.

Apart from historical worth, Miss Kite's selection and arrangement of documents furnish a fascinating character study through which hopeless and depressing riddles are satisfactorily solved. Interpreted through his own words, L'Enfant betrays as the root of his troubles with the Federal Commissioners appointed by President Washington to build the Capital City, the traditional repugnance which the mili-

tary man has always shown for civilian authority. Miss Kite sheds a brilliant illumination on his monetary vagaries (page 34-35 of her volume) when she comments: "Frenchman of the old regime, he was used to the idea of royal munificence offered as recompense for works of genius, but a business contract based on mutual agreement was foreign to his thought." It was likewise foreign to his thought, that his authority should be flaunted by Daniel Carroll of Duddington in seeking to erect a mansion where it would prove an obstacle to the L'Enfant map of parks and bisecting streets. He had been imbued with a deep-rooted reverence for the established order. He was an artist, an architect, and the most versatile engineer of his era, and something should be allowed for the eccentricities of genius. He ordered the Carroll house demolished, the final act in a long series which even the sympathetic Washington, whose aide-de-camp Major L'Enfant had been, interpreted as insubordination. He was dismissed from the Federal service and straightway entered upon those baleful years epitomized in his memorials to Congress and in many letters written to friends and which may be found among the papers which had accumulated at Green Hill Manor during L'Enfant's residence as a pensioner on the bounty of William Dudley Digges. One of these letters contains that lament unfortunately so frequently heard from those who serve the state unmindful of their own prosperity. This letter published by Dr. Morgan in volume 11 of the *Records of the Columbia Historical Society*, was written to Moses Young, a friend and confidante, then Consul-General of the United States at Madrid: "I at the onset of this unfortunate business had fortune friends and relations who generously supplied all my wants. They are no more, all have perished and with them my fortune."

Miss Kite's inclusion of L'Enfant in relation to the establishment of the seat of government only in the years 1791-1792 emphasizes the antagonism of the two most prominent proprietors, Daniel Carroll of Duddington and Notley Young, and there is an inference that Daniel Carroll the Commissioner showed undue sympathy for his relatives. Not a line in the official documents will sustain this suspicion. Ultimately Washington supported these two land owners in the bitter feud with L'Enfant and logically he systematically upheld his commissioners. As for relationship between the two Carrolls, Notley Young and the Brents of Virginia from whose quarry at Aquia Creek, came the material of which the Capitol and other public edifices were con-

structed, a tangled thread of kindred connected another Commissioner, Dr. David Stuart, with Thomas Peter, Georgetown proprietor, who married Martha Custis his step-daughter and the most extensive speculator in the new Capital, Thomas Law who married Elizabeth Custis her sister, both grand-daughters of Mrs. Washington. Daniel Carroll lost his fortune, but so did more seasoned speculators, Robert Morris, signer of the Declaration, financier of the Revolution, James Greenleaf his partner and a score of others including Benjamin Stoddert, Secretary of the Navy.

L'Enfant lost all that men prize most highly but he saved his great plan. Reading M. Jusserand's essay and Miss Kite's assortment of papers is like hearing the wraith of the unfortunate patriot laugh as derisively as Pitt at his foes, "Time will be on my side. I can afford to wait."

MARGARET BRENT DOWNING.

The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln. By CLAUDE BOWERS. (Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1929. Pp. xxii, 567. $5.00.)

The congressional system of reconstruction with its multitudinous ills is the theme of *The Tragic Era* (1865-1877). Coming later than those who have considered important aspects of the problem of restoring the seceding States to their normal relations in the Union, this author had the advantage of examining those collections, books, manuscripts, diaries, etc., which have been assembled in the two and fifty years that have passed since President Hayes in 1877 withdrew the last Federal soldiers from the South. This action left the people of that section free to strive for the control of their several governments, each of which was embarrassed by a staggering public debt piled up by unscrupulous carpetbaggers and ignorant freedmen.

A departure from Lincoln's plan of restoration was largely, though not wholly responsible for the immeasurable mischiefs that sprang from the operation of the congressional scheme. The limitations of Lincoln's system may be conceded; yet it was not without advantages. It aimed, for example, at restoring with the least possible innovation the Union of the Fathers. Moreover, the natural leaders of southern society, with a few exceptions, were to participate in the work of reorganization. Southern interests were not to be made the sport

of broken-down preachers and broken-down politicians who industriously wove the web of discord and sowed the seeds of hate.

Andrew Johnson, a courageous and honest statesman, attempted to administer the system of Lincoln, but by the Thirty-ninth Congress, which assembled in December, 1865, the entire work of reconstruction was snatched from executive hands. And this notwithstanding the fact that the Constitution does not enjoin upon Congress the duty of guaranteeing "to every State in this Union a republican form of government", but clearly makes *that* the duty of "the United States", that is of the congress, the executive, and the judiciary. Perhaps in 1787 the framers could not have easily have imagined the existence of feelings so hostile as those that in December, 1865, marked the relations of congress and the President.

In this book little is said of Lincoln's plan, because the author's subtitle, *The Revolution after Lincoln,* fixes the limits of his excellent inquiry. When it was observed in the preceding paragraph that Johnson endeavored to carry out Lincoln's principles, it should have been remarked that the new President was wanting in the tact of his predecessor. But if Andrew Johnson had been tutored by wisdom itself, he could not have acted in harmony with the radicals in Congress. They may best be described by the dramatist's fine verse: madmen "beating on a drum"—the drum of negro suffrage. The controversy with Lincoln, which is suggested by the Wade-Davis manifesto, published in the *New York Tribune,* was only postponed. It was destined inevitably to return.

In school we learned from teacher or from textbook that no Northern State had ever repudiated it public debts, but that the former Confederate States had done so. In entertaining stump speeches Colonel R. G. Ingersoll, too, gave us hints concerning the relation of latitude to public virtue. Except for a temporary repudiation by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania the above remarks about the sections are nearly correct. Mr. Bowers suggests to his readers a thousand justifications for repudiation in the South, and in support of his statements mainly depends upon public documents or the testimony of Republican leaders. Democrats are seldom summoned as witnesses.

By successive clippings the author strips Secretary Stanton of nearly every shred of character. Nevertheless his fairness somewhat tempers the wind to this shorn lamb, for General "Dick" Taylor, a splendid soldier, is far more severe.

Taylor had come to Washington to see Secretary Seward and others

who as Whigs had supported his father's administration. He had hoped by their influence with the President to secure better treatment for his brother-in-law, Jefferson Davis, then a prisoner at Fortress Monroe. He was also interested in the welfare of other Southern leaders confined in Northern prisons.

During General Taylor's visit he had seen at table wanton women respendent in the spoil of Southern matrons; he had heard on the Avenue the martial tread of volunteer generals. "Gorged with loot", he adds, "they spent it as lavishly as Morgan's buccaneers after the sack of Panama." He has this estimate of Stanton:

> One, the War Secretary, I did not meet. A spy under Buchanan, a tyrant under Lincoln, and a traitor to Johnson, this man was as cruel and crafty as Domitian. I never saw him. In the end conscience, long dormant, came as Alecto, and he was not; and the temple of Justice, on whose threshold he stood, escaped profanation.

No one can fairly question the ability of Stanton or deny the value to his country of his services during the war. Unfortunately his partisanship surpassed his patriotism, for a true patriot aims at improving the general welfare not at the success of a faction.

By President Grant, Stanton had been nominated to a justiceship in the United States Supreme Court and was confirmed by the Senate. Four days afterward he died under circumstances so mysterious as to suggest suicide.

There are likewise included in this book interesting sketches of Sumner, Stevens, Butler, Ashley and others.

The difference between Lincoln and the Radicals on the subject of negro suffrage plainly appears in his letter to Michael Hahn, Governor of Louisiana. On March 13, 1864, the President thus wrote:

> . . . Now you are about to have a convention, which, among other things, will probably define the elective franchise. I barely suggest for your private consideration whether some of the colored people may not be let in—as, for instance, the very intelligent, and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks. They would probably help, in some trying time to come, to keep the jewel of liberty within the family of freedom. But this is only a suggestion, not to the public, but to you alone.

In short, Lincoln would confer the elective franchise upon very intelligent and very brave negroes. The privilege would have been *a reward*. By influencing a grant of the suffrage to some negroes Lincoln would have cut the ground from under the feet of the Radicals

and doubtless on that account some of them were secretly pleased at his assassination.

No mention is made in this book of the November laws, concerning freedmen, free negroes, and mulattoes, passed by the Mississippi legislature shortly before the meeting of Congress in December, 1865. In that and in similar legislation will be found some, though inadequate justification of the harsh measures of the Radicals. Nor is much said by the author about the meddlesome Bureau of Freedmen, Refugees, and Abandoned Lands. By their interference its officials retarded restoration. Republicans in general, it is true, appear to have been more impressed by the unnumbered outrages and murders manufactured in Northern newspaper offices. Many, to be sure, were fabricated in the South, made out of whole cloth, and reported to the North there to be turned into shapes that were appalling.

Mr. Bowers presents to us new views of time-honored worthies. By indisputable evidence certain seldom-equaled soldiers are shorn of a measure of their glory. In the service of grim-visaged war their deeds rose almost above a mortal pitch, but in the weak, piping time of peace the garlands withered on their brows. Those who have been admirers of Grant the soldier will be surprised to read a list of his political limitations as President and to find him connected with many a doubtful transaction. Sheridan too is lowered as soon as he touches politics. The grossness of their party leaders was sufficient to drag them down.

The culmination of the orgies that prevailed after 1865 appears in the strange settlement of the disputed presidential election of 1876, when Southern leaders sacrificed their prospects by abandoning the claims of Samuel Jones Tilden in order to wring from Republicans a consent to withdraw from the Southern States the Union troops still in that section. General Hayes made the promise, was duly inaugurated, and kept his engagement by recalling the Federal troops from Dixie. Thus, in 1877, ended the era of destruction which began with the firing on Sumter. Actual reconstruction commenced with the struggle of Southern people to gain control of their State governments. Twelve golden years they had been compelled to pass unimproved.

It is true that the literature dealing with the subject of congressional reconstruction is rather abundant. Not a few of its phases have been examined by some of our most capable historians, but generally they have described a few topics, an unusual happening

or the restoration of a single State. Therefore a more comprehensive survey was demanded. The exhaustive work of Mr. Bowers supplies this deficiency for it is at once the most systematic and interesting account of this intricate part of our history. In a word, it is an instructive and admirable book.

Will the author pardon the present reviewer for barely suggesting that without effort a fairer face could have been painted for the Republican organization? One could admit that it is in this epoch that an enemy would be likely to discover the blot in the Republican escutcheon. He could concede it and yet feel under no obligation to undertake the defense of such spokesmen as Ashley or Butler, party irregulars. If this author seems to assume the advocate, and the dyer's hand becomes subdued to what it works in, he is not unsupported by facts—facts that he summons by battalions.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

Canada in the Commonwealth: From Conflict to Co-Operation. By the Right Honourable Sir ROBERT BORDEN, G. C. M. G. (Oxford: University Press. 1929. Pp. xvi, 144.)

Sir Robert Borden, the author of this valuable volume, has had a distinguished legal and political career, and we may add, he has also been identified with the academic field. If I mistake not he spent some of his earlier years teaching in an American institution. More recently, he was lecturer at Toronto University, and published a series of Canadian Constitutional Studies. He is thus thoroughly equipped with the requirements of authorship. The volume under review comprises a series of lectures delivered at the University of Oxford, under the Rhodes Foundation. He states that the purpose of these lectures was not to attempt even an outline of so vast a subject as the history of Canada, but rather to portray such leading features as might perhaps awaken an interest in its history. He is profoundly impressed by the dramatic significance with which the story of French colonization in North America is invested; and says that he believes that were it not for the French occupation of the St. Lawrence Valley and of Acadia, it can hardly be doubted that Canada would have passed out of the British orbit. The St. Lawrence Valley and Acadia would have been occupied by organized communities radiating from New England and from New York, and

would have been swept into the Revolution or involved in some peaceful "separation". As the author acknowledges, the sketches embodied in the volume are extremely discursive; nevertheless, there is a degree of unity. Chapters I to VI tell the story of Canada until the Peace of Paris (1763). They are comprehensive; and the narrative is well done. Chapter VIII discusses the Revolutionary War, and the part played by the Loyalists whom the author describes as "an enterprising, energetic and highly intelligent people, whose memories of the harshness and cruelty with which they were expelled and of the hardships, privations and sufferings which they endured have come down through many generations to their descendants" (p. 71). Chapter IX deals with the Quebec Act (1774) and the Constitutional Act (1791), and a high tribute is paid to the great Irishman Edmund Burke who had so unavailingly pleaded on the eve of the American Revolution to admit the people of the colonies into an interest in the British Constitution. The author ascribes the preservation of Canada to the Empire to Lord Durham, Lord Grey, and Lord Elgin, who "followed the path to which Burke had pointed". Here should be noted a paragraph which the reviewer regards quite significant:

> Lack of foresight was . . . manifest in his [Durham's] anticipation that the French race in Canada would be absorbed by the British. Ten centuries have brought about in the British Isles commingling but neither absorption nor fusion of races. One may still discern the romantic imagination and valorous temperament of the Celt, shot through with slender and intermingling threads of mirth and melancholy; the sturdy, independent, liberty-loving spirit of the Saxon which has held firm the thin red line on many a field; the Norse strain distinguished by initiative, resourcefulness, energy and adventure; and the Norman genius for leadership, instinct for orderly government, self-control and discipline. So it was futile to expect in Canada the absorption of a virile people deeply attached to their religion, and their traditions. Nor was it in the least desirable that such a fusion would take place. The qualities of the French and English temperaments are in many respects complementary. Each is capable of distinctive service to the State and each has given it. Not in fusion but through co-operation the highest service of the two races can best be given to Canada (p. 80).

The final chapters of the volume are unquestionably the most valuable, and of the events therein recorded Sir Robert might say with truth, *quorum pars magna fui*. He was Premier of the Dominion at the outbreak of the World War, and was in a large measure instrumental in bringing about the recognition of the British Do-

minions as autonomous nations, their representation at the Paris Peace Conference, and the appointment of a Canadian Minister at Washington. These chapters have particular interest for the American, for be it said to the discredit of Americans, many of them know little of an accurate nature about Canada. The following in this connection is illuminating:

> Between the British Commonwealth and the American Republic there has been (during the last three quarters of a century) a remarkable contrast in the tendencies of political evolution. In the United States, by reason of the admitted supremacy of the Federal authority in matters of Imperial concern, power has been shifted from the States to the Central Government. There has been a precisely opposite evolution in the British Commonwealth where the authority of the Imperial Government has gradually diminished through the increasing jurisdiction and power of the Dominions (p. 123).

The present status of England and the Dominions may be summed up as follows: "They are autonomous Communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any respect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations". There is a paragraph on the final page of this immensely informative volume which makes interesting reading at the moment: "But apart from the hope that we have in the League of Nations, shall we not recognize an imperative duty resting upon the British Commonwealth and the American Republic? Not by formal alliance but in union of honourable ideals and in loyal coöperation for their fulfillment they can maintain international justice, and hold the world's peace inviolate. This only lies before them, clear, unmistakable, imminent. By the measure of its fulfillment they will be judged at the bar of history" (p. 129).

This is an exceptionally important and timely book; and students of British American history are now provided with a volume that is both instructive and authoritative. It is well made, and there is nothing to which exception may be taken in its content, except the use of an unfortunate term on page 64, which no doubt was transcribed from an English document, and a misprint on page 40. These are, however, quite insignificant. It has an excellent bibliography and index, and, like all Oxford University Press publications, is splendidly printed.

P. W. Browne.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A full account of the annual meeting of the Association, held at the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., December 27-28, will be given by the secretary in the April issue of the REVIEW.

The Most Rev. Paschal Robinson, titular Archbishop of Tiana, formerly professor of medieval history in the Catholic University of America, has been appointed apostolic nuncio to Dublin.

Professor Thomas F. Tout, authority on medieval history, died in London on October 23, at the age of 74. For thirty-five years Professor Tout held the chair of history in the University of Manchester. He was at various times president of the Historical Association, president of the International Historical Congress at Brussels in 1923, president of the Royal Historical Society, fellow of the British Academy, governor of the Johns Rylands Library, and Ford Lecturer in English history at Oxford. His best known works are the *Empire and the Papacy, History of England, France and England: Their Relations in the Middle Ages and Now*; he made many contributions to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, the *English Historical Review*, and to *History*. The *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, fourth series, Volume XII, just published, contains the presidential address of Professor Tout, delivered last February, in which he gives a sympathetic survey of History and Historians in America.

A grant of $25,000 made by the Carnegie Corporation of New York to the Mediaeval Academy of America makes available a "revolving fund" to be used for the publication of such books as may be considered worth while contributions to medieval studies. All proceeds from the sale of books to be published by this grant will revert to the fund, thus making possible further publications. Inquiries and data concerning manuscripts in course of preparation should be sent to the Academy, Cambridge, Mass.

Speculum for October presents a study of Literature and Learning in the English Civil Service in the Fourteenth Century, by the late Professor T. F. Tout; Helen R. Bittermann writes of the Organ in the Early Middle Ages; C. R. Morey describes, with illustrations, the

Covers of the Lorsch Gospels; and the fourth instalment of the account of the Mediaeval Academy Excavations at Cluny is given by K. J. Conant.

A revised edition of Professor Ragatz's *Syllabus for the Study of Medieval Times,* recently issued (1929), needs a further revision in its antique attitude towards the papacy. To speak of the "ascendancy" of the Bishop of Rome as a "natural deference for the leading churchman of the old capital city" is a sad way to give documentary evidence. Catholic teachers who otherwise might wish to welcome this *Syllabus* will hesitate when they are assured that "the Petrine Theory was evolved to justify an actuality."

One of the really important collections of sources published recently in the domain of historical theology is *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: Its Historical Development and Dogmatic Fulfilment* (pp. 653), by the Rev. Bernard A. McKenna, S. T. D., who holds the Duval Chair in the Catholic University of America. The historical significance of this valuable collection of sources is that on December 8, 1929, the Church celebrated the Diamond Jubilee of the definition and pronouncement of the dogma itself. The volume contains the *Ineffabilis Deus* in Latin, English, Irish, French, and German; descriptions of the definition in St. Peter's, December 8, 1854, by Cardinal Wiseman and Archbishop Dixon; dissertations on the history of doctrinal development of the dogma; historical sketches of devotion to the Immaculate Conception in various lands and religious orders; and an exceptionally well-written article on the United States and the Immaculate Conception by Bishop Shahan, Rector-Emeritus of the University. There is likewise a list of classified works on the dogma and a selected bibliography of works dealing with its history. With rare foresight, Dr. McKenna has appended a catalogue of the prelates present at the definition. The volume closes with a sketch of the scholastic work done by the Duval Chair since 1918.

Though not strictly within the field of this journal, we call attention to a serviceable reference volume, *Political Handbook of the World Parliaments,* edited by Malcolm W. Davis and Walter H. Mallory, and published by the Yale University Press for the Council on Foreign Relations (pp. 198). The new edition is corrected to January 1, 1929, and does not, therefore, include information concerning the Vatican City. For each country there is given a statement embracing

the name of capital, area, population, ruler, cabinet, parliament, party programmes and leaders, and the press. One finds, for example, the aims of the Christian Socialist Party of Austria, "strongly Catholic", and learns that the *Reichspost* is its organ. Under Belgium, the Catholic Party, which has 70 representatives in the upper chamber and 78 in the lower chamber, is likewise described, and 12 Catholic papers are listed. Students of Catholic political thought will find this volume most useful for the information it gives concerning parties and press in Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, Irish Free State, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and Switzerland. In the list of periodicals printed in the section devoted to the United States, there is none representing history. Why should not the *American Historical Review* be included?

Teachers will be aided by an evaluation of Recent Textbooks of Modern History, contributed by F. L. Nussbaum to the September issue of the *Journal of Modern History*.

No. 3 of the first volume of *Historical Essays*, published by the seminarians of St. Meinrad's, Indiana, has as its leading contribution a careful study of the *Aeterni Patris* of Leo XIII, by Rev. Raymond Stocker. There is also an account of the Leopoldine Society, by Bernard Thompson; Rev. Victor L. Goossens writes of John Francis Rivet who labored among the Indians of the Northwest during the early days of that territory; and Monastic Constitutions are discussed by Rev. Victor Dux.

The first volume of Donald L. Galbraith's *Treatise on Ecclesiastical Heraldry* has been published by Messrs. Heffer, London.

Early Plans for World Peace, discussed by Professor C. C. Tansill in the *Historical Outlook* for November, concern the *De Recuperatione Terre Sancte* of Pierre du Bois, 1306, and Emric Cruce's *Nouveau Cynée*, 1623.

In his story of the first Christian hierarchy, *From Tarsus to Rome* (Longmans, pp. 167), Rev. Dr. Herman J. Heuser presents a study of St. Paul's career "by concentrating attention upon the coördination of the sacerdotal ministry under the sovereign authority of Peter."

Herder has announced a second revised edition of Bishop Buch-

berger's *Lexikon fuer Theologie und Glaube* in ten volumes. The first edition (*Kirchliches Handlexikon,* which appeared in 1904 in two large volumes and was of great help to the editors of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*), contained 25,000 articles on all topics of interest to ecclesiastics from apologetics to world history. The co-editors at the time were the flower of German Catholic scholarship and the work became popular in all parts of the world. The second edition will be an entirely new work of over 30,000 articles and will treat of all questions of an ecclesiastical nature. The first volume is now ready. The price of the *Lexikon* is $8.50 a volume.

The Catholic Question, 1688-1929, is a study in political history by Philip Hughes (Sheed and Ward, pp. 334).

Saint Catherine of Siena, by Alice Curtayne (Sheed and Ward, pp. 268), is a well told account of this attractive figure in Church history.

Recent announcements of the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge include a *History of the Creeds,* by Dr. F. J. Badcock; the *Book of Isaiah in the Light of the Assyrian Monuments,* by Charles Boulflower; and *English Religious Life in the Eighth Century* as illustrated by contemporary letters, by Thomas Allison.

The *Analecta Bollandiana* for October contains many points of interest to the specialist. Father Delehaye studies the ancient hagiography of Ravenna from the evidence of mural inscriptions of the martyrologium of St. Jerome and of the medieval legends of Ravenna's bishops. The value of some of the legends may be gauged from the fact that what passes for a life of St. Aderitus is nothing but a sermon of St. Peter Damian on St. Eleucadius, with an appropriate change of names. Father Grosjean publishes a catalogue of codices dealing with Celtic saints to be found in the libraries of Edinburgh. An interesting item is a study by Father Peeters on the martyrdom of St. Julian of Emessa. Father Delehaye summarizes the work done by the Danish excavators at Salona, and Father Coens discusses at length the works of Wilhelm Levison in regard to the legend of St. Ursula. The suggestion that the original number of companions, indicated thus XI, was later read (according to classical convention) as 11,000 is treated with sympathy. More than 140 books are reviewed at some length.

L'Introduction des Décrets du Concile de Trente dans les Pays-

Bas et dans la Principauté de Liége, by Abbé F. Willcox (Louvain, Librairie Universitaire), based upon a wide survey of original and unpublished sources, corrects, *inter alia,* the findings of previous historians respecting the reservations of Margaret of Parma, and settles the important question of the date of publication of the decrees in the province of Utrecht.

The formal articles in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* for October, are: "L'application du droit de régale spirituelle en France du XII au XIV siècle (concluded)", by G. Mollat; and "L'Église constitutionelle du Nord pendant la Terreur", by J. Peter and C. Poulet. Ch. Martin, S. J., contributes a note, "Un prétendu commentaire de Sévère d'Antioche sur les Actes des Apôtres".

The quarterly *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale,* begun in January, 1929, by the Benedictines of Mont César (Louvain), has already achieved a well-deserved reputation. Its scope is that of historical theology from the time of Tertullian to the Council of Trent (about 1560), to the exclusion, however, of sixteenth-century Protestant theology. All the articles and notes are *de première main* and it is evident that the learned editors and their collaborators have opened a new pathway in the field of history. Among these articles may be mentioned with high praise the work of Dom Lottin, Dr. Grabmann, Canon Lebon, and Professor Landgraf who has recently been added to the faculty of the school of sacred sciences in the Catholic University of America. Each issue has seen a scholarly *Bulletin* of ancient and medieval theological works on the same plan as the *Social Science Abstracts.* The book reviews, it need scarcely be added, are models of conciseness and authority. Such a publication under such admirable auspices as the University of Louvain will give hope to all who have justly complained of the contemporary lack of interest in positive theology.

"Notes sur l'Iconographie de Saint Pierre", by Jeanne Vielliard; "Legendes et Reliques: le cas des onze mille vierges", by Guy de Tervarent; and "Les derneries travaux de M. Levillain sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis à l'époque Mérovingienne", by Georges Tessier, are to be found in *Le Moyen Age* for January-April.

Another addition to the growing list of recent books concerning Joan of Arc is, *For Joan of Arc* (Sheed and Ward), originally written

by ten members of the French Academy. The contributors include the late Marshal Foch, Maurice Barrès, Bishop Baudrillart, Louis Bertrand, and Georges Goyau. *Le Procès de Condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc,* by Pierre Champion, gives in two volumes (pp. 416, 450) the Latin text, with French translation, of all the documents in the trial, together with notes and commentaries (Paris, Champion).

The Société d'Archéologie de Seine-et-Marne has published *Chartes et Documents de l'Abbaye Cistercienne de Preuilly,* by Albert Catel and Maurice Lecomte (Paris, Champion).

Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte, XLVIII, 2, contains the following articles: "Kleine Beiträge uber Joachim von Fiore", by Herbert Grundmann; "Zur Lebensgeschichte des Marsilius von Padua", by Johannes Haller; "Das lateinische Original von Luther's 'Vater-Unser vorwärts und rückwärts' vom Jahre 1516", by Otto Clemen; "Franz Lambert von Avignon und das Verfassungsideal der Reformatio ecclesiarum von 1526", by W. Maurer; and "Die Silberne Arche", by Ernest Kochs.

The Oxford University Press will publish in the early spring Mr. Aubrey F. G. Bell's translation of the *History of Iberian Civilization,* by J. P. de Oliveira Martins, distinguished Portuguese historian who died in 1894.

The latest addition to the Catalogue Series of *Hispanic Notes and Monographs,* published by the Hispanic Society of America, is a *List of Books Printed before 1601* in the library of the Society, compiled by Clara Louisa Penney (pp. 274).

The survey of the Archivos Historicos del Alto Aragón, by Ricardo del Arco, is continued in the July-August issue of *Universidad.* The number for September-October is devoted to Paschal Galindo Romeo's catalogue of "La Biblioteca de Benedicto XIII".

Writing on the Church To-day in Norway, Veronica Lorentzen, in the November *Blackfriars,* notes that the first church erected in that country was at St. Olaf's in Oslo in 1856; that there are 2600 Catholics in a population of 2,500,000; but that the Church is making an appeal to the intellectual classes, as was evidenced by the conversion of Sigrid Undset, winner of the Nobel prize for literature in 1928.

Sheed and Ward announce a *History of Europe,* by Bede Jarrett, O. P., provincial of the English Dominicans.

Messrs. Harper and Brothers announce for future publication the *Rise of Modern Europe,* a series of twenty illustrated volumes of approximately 100,000 words each, under the general editorship of Professor William L. Langer of Harvard University. Particular emphasis, it is stated, will be given to the influence of the United States on the course of European history and to the effect of foreign policies on this country. Following the plan of the *American Nation* series, the "historian's history", published by the same firm, each volume will be written by an American specialist in the period it covers. Among the contributors will be Rev. Dr. Robert H. Lord, whose volume will be entitled the *Catholic Reformation,* 1560-1610, and Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University, who will write the volume for the period 1871-1900, to be called *Prosperity and Doubt.*

Acta Episcoporum, by F. M. Stenton; and the Appropriation of English Parish Churches during the Reign of Edward III, by K. L. Wood-Legh, are among the studies in the *Cambridge Historical Journal,* III, no. 1.

It is scarcely possible to appreciate the tremendous labor and care that must have been involved in the preparation of the *Bibliography of Oliver Cromwell,* compiled by Professor Wilbur C. Abbott of Harvard University (Harvard University Press, pp. xxviii, 540, $12.50). A few figures will best show the conscientious and thorough efforts which the learned editor has made in the compilation of his work. There are 3520 bibliographical items, arranged alphabetically under each year, from 1597 to 1928 inclusively, with place of publication and description of each title. There is a catalogue of portraits numbering 702, also arranged alphabetically under painters and engravers, with dates, description, size of each portrait, and further divided into single, group, and false portraits. There is a list of 14 satirical prints from English and Dutch sources, now in the British Museum, Sutherland, and other collections. And there are indexes covering 145 pages. There is also a valuable introductory essay on historic Cromwell, and a reproduction of a hitherto unknown portrait of Cromwell, painted from life by Robert Walker, and now in the possession of the author. In item 3520 a typographical error gives the date of Miss Davenport's

bibliography a century too early. A comparison of the references to Cromwell in Stock's *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments*, published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, with Professor Abbott's items of similar years and dates shows several not included in the latter. It would seem also that some confusion is likely to result from the failure to mark a distinction between old style and new style chronology. This volume will be an indispensable guide to students of Cromwellian history, and especially to the study of the Puritan Revolution.

Denis Gwynn's *Cardinal Wiseman* (Burns, Oates, pp. 300) is a more or less popular compilation which, while it gives a fresh interpretation of this churchman, adds little to Wilfrid Ward's biography of thirty years ago. There are splendid opportunities in this class of biographical writing awaiting students with interests beyond the cardinals of England, all of whom have been frequently portrayed. Little or nothing has been done toward making adequate studies of the Irish cardinals, Cullen and Logue, many of the French cardinals, or the Cardinal Secretaries of State, Antonelli and Rampolla.

The October number of the *Downside Review* offers an article entitled, "Our First Novice", by Dom Hugh Connolly, having reference to Nicholas Fitzjames of Somersetshire, the first to receive the habit at Douay; an account of Abbott Kidderminister and Monastic Studies, by W. A. Pantin; a paper on Rome and the English Prayer-Book, by H. O. Evennett; and an essay in good style on Bishop Alfred Curtis, by Rev. Dr. Edwin Ryan of the Catholic University.

The letters written by Scottish Jesuits in the middle of the seventeenth century, during the Cromwellian occupation, found among the unpublished manuscripts of Blairs College, have been incorporated in the *Blairs Papers, 1603-1660*, by M. V. Hay (London, Sands).

A recent acquisition to the Connolly Library in the Catholic University of America is an original copy of an *Impartial History of the Most Material Occurrences in the Kingdom of Ireland during the Two Last Years, with the present State of Both Armies. Published to prevent Mistakes, and to give the World a Prospect of the future Success of Their Majesties Arms in that Nation. Written by an Eyewitness to the most Remarkable Passages.* The author was the Rev. George Story, chaplain to Earl of Drogheda's regiment, and the book

was published by Richard Chiswell, at the "Rose and Crown" in St. Paul's Churchyard, London, 1691. This copy is from the library of Sir Edmund Sullivan, Master of the Rolls, Ireland, and bears his book-plate "Regard au Mort". The first part of the book (pp. 163) opens with the "happy Kingdom" at the time of the Restoration (1660), and describes "the Duke of York's managing" to restore the "Popish Party" to political power, his subsequent "proclaiming" (1685), and the coming of the Prince of Orange and the state of Ireland at that time. "There was a Cloud in Ireland that seem'd to threaten us, if due care was not taken in time to disperse it." The landing of King James in Ireland (March, 1689) and the series of military events up to August, when the Duke of Schomberg, "General of All Their Majesties Forces", landed, are described; and then the swift, decisive fight for the control of Ireland is sketched in a language that is as attractive as it is grippingly intense. The *Continuation* (pp. 328) was published in 1693 and is illustrated with "Copper Sculptures" describing the most important places of battle. The two books are bound in boards with Russian leather binding with an old-fashioned clasp of a later date.

The contents of *Studies* for September include a preliminary statement respecting Irish Emigration to the West Indies, 1612-1643, by Aubrey Gwynn; an article on O'Connell and University Education, by T. Corcoran, S. J.; one on Ephesus, Pagan and Christian, by Michael Tierney; and another on Catholic Holland, by Fergal McGrath, S. J.

Titles of recent pamphlets issued by the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland include: *The Cistercians in Ireland,* by Rev. Neil Kevin; *Royal and Saintly Cashel,* by Andrew Finn; *St. Alphonsus, Most Zealous Doctor,* by Rev. John Carr, C. SS. R.; and *What Christ Thought of the Scriptures and of Inspiration,* by Dom J. B. McLaughlin, O. S. B.

The *Irish Rosary* for July is an "Emancipation number", containing the full texts of the following addresses: The Apostleship of St. Patrick, by Professor J. M. O'Sullivan; the Elizabethan Persecution, by Rev. P. J. Gannon, S. J.; the Cromwellian Persecution, by Louis J. Walsh; the Penal Laws, by Rev. A. M. Crofts, O. P.; Pre-Emancipation Catholic Associations, by Very Rev. Peter Canon Monahan; the Emancipation Struggle, by Rev. Dr. A. H. Ryan. The October

issue prints Frederick W. Ryan's paper submitted to the international historical conference at Oslo in 1928, on Malta as a Centre of Historical Research; and an account of the Libraries of Belgium, by Stephen J. Brown, S. J.

The enterprising Talbot Press, Dublin, is endeavouring to institute an *Irish Historical Library* and its first volume is *The Irish Papal Battalion of 1860.* England and France have been unjust to this battalion, and so Mr. Berkeley has revisited the battlefields and had access to official documents in the Italian War Office for his new study, in order to show what an important factor the battalion was in the campaign.

Besides the recent works on Archbishop Walsh and Daniel O'Connell, the same firm has just issued perhaps its most distinctive volume, *Gaelic Literature Surveyed,* by Aodh de Blacam, one of Ireland's most polished writers. It covers the whole range of Irish literary history, dealing with the Fenian Cycle, the Bardic Poets, the Seventeenth Century, and the hidden Ireland of the Penal Age. It suggests the outline of a Catholic literary history and the rudiments of a Catholic system of criticism, and demonstrates the significance of the literature in illuminating Irish social and political history. It claims only to be a literary critic's account of the material available, contains some Gaelic poems never before printed; and written in popular, lucid, and graceful style, it is a work of mature scholarship and well-balanced criticism. It will delight the general reader and appeal to the scholar. The book is beautifully turned out at 12s. 6d.

Longmans Green and Co., London, will publish early in the year 1930 a volume on *The Elizabethan Reformation in Ireland,* by Father Myles V. Ronan, Dublin, which will be a companion to his remarkable book on the Reformation during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. The coming volume will demonstrate the falsity of the plea put forward by Protestant writers that the Irish bishops and clergy went over to the "Reform" and that consequently the churches and cathedrals became Protestant property. Father Ronan shows from original letters of the Lord Deputies and Elizabeth's own bishops that the "Reform" made no progress under that Queen on account of the "ungodly Irish", and that at most five Marian bishops accepted uniformity of worship and two more accepted her supremacy. An interesting portion of the book will deal with the efforts of James Fitz-

maurice of Desmond, one of the noblest sons of Ireland, and of his episcopal emissaries at the courts of Rome, France, and Spain, for the invasion of Ireland and the destruction of Elizabeth's power over Church and State. The author bases his study on original documents in the archives of London, Rome, and Spain. It will be the first authoritative and exhaustive exposition of this momentous period.

The annual list of graduate theses in Canadian history, published in the September number of the *Canadian Historical Review,* contains the following titles: Economic Institutions under the Direction of the Catholic Church in Canada (A. B. Latham, *Harvard*); History of Methodism in Ontario (S. F. Maine, *Chicago*); and the Church of England in British North America, 1774-1854 (C. G. Pierson, *Wisconsin*).

The Rev. George O'Neill, S. J., has written the *Life of the Reverend Julien Edmund Tenison Woods, 1832-1889,* a well-known missionary in Tasmania and other parts of Australia, and in the East Indies (Sydney, Pellegrini, pp. 416).

Mr. Cecil Jane of London is compiling for the Hakluyt Society a three-volume work of selected documents on Columbus. Mr. Jane and Miss Gould have been successful in gathering much new material relating to the discoverer.

A considerable body of documents relating to the settlement and early history of Maryland was recently purchased from Messrs. Sotheby, London, by Messrs. Quaritch (see their catalogues, pp. 59-79, 7-20, respectively).

The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts, reprinted from the copy of the 1648 edition in the Henry E. Huntington Library, has come from the Harvard University Press (pp. ix, 59, $5.00). There is an historical introduction by Dr. Max Farrand. The present edition reproduces the original in type-facsimile line for line, and word for word. A re-reading of the articles on witches (p. 5), religion (p. 18), heresy (p. 24), and Jesuits (p. 26) will show how far we have travelled since that time.

The religious aspect of the warfare waged by Sir William Pepperell is emphasized in Dr. William L. Johnson's Stories of the American Revolution told in the September issue of *New Hampshire.*

The following papers were among those read at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, Durham and Chapel Hill, N. C., December 30-January 1: the Theory of Persecution, by Ernest W. Nelson, Duke University; the Social Aspects of French Heresy, Austin P. Evans, Columbia; Restrictions on the Teacher in the Medieval University of Paris, Dorothy L. Mackay, West Virginia University; Erasmus and Toleration, Wallace K. Ferguson, New York University; Costellio, Ronald Bainton, Yale; Socinus and Rationalism, Frederick C. Church, University of Idaho; and the Risorgimento, by Kent R. Greenfield, Yale. The REVIEW voices its grateful appreciation of the courtesy of Duke University for the luncheon conference of editors of historical periodicals, at which editorial representatives of the *American Historical Review, Mississippi Valley Historical Review, Speculum, Hispanic American Historical Review, Historical Outlook, Journal of Modern History, Journal of Agricultural History, Isis,* and the *Catholic Historical Review* met in informal and helpful discussion, over which Dr. J. F. Jameson of the Library of Congress, for many years managing editor of the *American Historical Review,* presided.

The *Atlantic Monthly* for October, under the caption, "A Diplomatic Incident: When Washington Closed Our Vatican Ministry", prints the correspondence on the subject between Secretary Seward and Rufus King, last United States minister to the Papal States. These are copies found among the papers of Gino Speranza, once assistant to Ambassador Page, and duplicate those to be found in the archives of the Department of State. It is not stated who wrote the peculiar introduction to the documents for the *Atlantic.* The first paragraph contains about as many untruths and half-truths as can be found in any twenty-three lines. A reading of King's despatches a few pages beyond will make it plain that the claims advanced for the withdrawal of the appropriation for this mission had no foundation in fact. The American Protestant Church was *not* forced outside the city of Rome. On the contrary, as King emphatically and repeatedly maintained,

> It is not his Holiness the Pope, but the American Congress who by closing the mission here, have driven American Protestant worship outside the gates of Rome. So long as the United States had a representative at the Papal court, and a chapel connected with the United States legation, no interference whatever was thought of or attempted with American Protestant worship in this Catholic city.

The real reason for the closing of the mission was, as King intimated, that the government of Victor Emmanuel might the more promptly be recognized.

Marcus L. Hansen, in the October issue of the *New England Quarterly,* gives an account of the Second Colonization of New England (the coming of the Irish, French, and Italians), which is marked by originality of interpretation and charm of style.

Volume XIX of the *Historical Records and Studies* of the United States Catholic Historical Society (pp. 139) has more than ordinary popular interest. Illustrated by a photographic reproduction and hieroglyphics, a detailed account of the Codex Saville, America's Oldest Book, is given by Rev. Mariano Cuevas, S. J. The Codex was recently secured in Lima by the Heye Foundation of New York City. Rev. Francis X. Talbot, S. J., contributes new data on Blessed Isaac Jogues, S. J. Three papers are offered by Thomas F. Meehan, a venerable and beloved councilor of the American Catholic Historical Association. The first treats of Archbishop Hughes and Mexico, an account based upon a letter of Buchanan to Hassard, the Archbishop's biographer, and upon excerpts from the *Diary* of President Polk. Mr. Meehan's second contribution concerns the Centenary of American Catholic Fiction, and discusses Rev. Dr. Charles Pise and his novel, *Father Rowland*; Joanna Monica England, youngest sister of the Bishop of Charleston and our first American Catholic woman editor and journalist; early American Catholic poetry; and pioneer women writers. The editor's third paper presents the story of Two Pioneer Russian Missionaries—Mother Elizabeth Galitzen, and her kinsman, Prince Gallitzin, the "Apostle of the Alleghenies". The other papers in the volume are an account of the career of James Shields, Soldier, Justice, Senator, by Dr. John G. Coyle, and a study of the Beginnings of Government in Maryland, by Grace H. Sherwood. Bibliographical references accompany these two last essays, but the volume unfortunately lacks an index.

In the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* for September are to be found a biographical essay on Samuel Castner, Jr., one of the Society's early promoters, by Dr. Lawrence F. Flick; a continuation of the history of the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, 1855-1928, by a Member of the Sisterhood; and a well-documented account of the Catholic Church in Liberia, by Henry P. Fisher, C. S. P.

The *Annual Official Catholic Review and Directory* is the title of the supplement to the November 8 issue of the *Lake Shore Visitor*, the official organ of the Diocese of Erie. Its feature article is the Story of the Roman Question, by Rev. F. S. Betten, S. J. Texts of the treaty and concordat are also printed, together with the address of the dean of the diplomatic corps to the Pope, the address of Pius to the Lenten preachers of Rome, and several pages of photographs of scenes in and around the Vatican City. A review is also given of diocesan events during the past year.

To the October number of *Mid-America*, Rev. Matthias M. Hoffmann contributes Some Unpublished Lorian Documents (letters of Pierre Loras, the first bishop of Dubuque); Raphael N. Hamilton, S. J., a study of General James Wilkinson and His Religious Affiliations; and Howard E. Egan an account of Irish Immigration to Minnesota, 1865-1890.

A Centennial Story of Mother Seton's Daughters, American Sisters of Charity in Cincinnati, Ohio, a charming essay of twenty-one pages, was written by Sister Mary Agnes McCann, Ph. D., in commemoration of this centenary held October 27, 1929. The marvelous growth of this order is shown by the list of 118 schools and institutions established since 1829.

In the *Indiana Magazine of History*, September, Mr. George S. Cottman has an appreciation of the work of John Mahoney, a Catholic sculptor of Indianapolis. Miss Inez P. Joice writes on Old Cemeteries in Knox County, making some reference to the burying ground attached to the old Cathedral at Vincennes and to the early practice of burying the dead under the family pews. Janet P. Shaw gives a sketch of Francis Bosseron, friend of Father Gibault and mayor of Vincennes when Clark took possession of the town in 1778. Bosseron's Account Book is printed in full.

The first publication to appear under the auspices of the recently organized Iowa Catholic Historical Society is an account of the *Catholic Sponsors of Iowa*, by Rev. M. M. Hoffmann. This first number of the Society's *Collections* traces the military and political careers of Gen. George W. Jones and Gen. Augustus C. Dodge who were the first to represent the State in the United States Senate.

The *New Mexico Historical Review* is seldom lacking in material

of Catholic interest. The October number contains a Documentary History of the Rio Grande Pueblos, New Mexico, by Adolph F. Bandelier; and a History of Early Printing in New Mexico, by Douglas C. McMurtrie, with an appended bibliography containing many titles of studies relating to Catholic life in the Southwest. The latter article gives a full discussion of the contribution made by Rev. Antonio J. Martinez to the history of the press in New Mexico.

Mr. Washington E. Connor, New York, in accordance with the expressed wish of his wife, Jeannette Thurber Connor, has presented to the Library of Congress the photostats and transcripts of Latin-American materials made for her in the libraries of the United States and Spain. These date from the second half of the sixteenth to the early part of the eighteenth century. In addition, there are many maps and a number of papers written by Mrs. Connor, including drafts of a book which she had long been intending to write, to be called the "Chronicles of Florida". Among the documents and photostats are many relating to the missions of Florida (see this REVIEW for July, 1929, p. 228). These papers, about 1000 in number, were given with the proviso that the Florida State Historical Society should have the use of them for ten years before being placed at the disposal of the general public. The presentation was made by Miss Alice Lerch of the New York Public Library, acting for Mr. Connor.

Under the energetic direction of its secretary, Dr. James A. Robertson, the Florida State Historical Society is busy with several projected publications. The Society has recently received from Professor Arthur P. Whittaker, Western Reserve University, a compilation of documents, mostly in Spanish and French, which have been translated by Professor Whittaker who has also written an extended historical introduction to them. These documents, which treat of the commercial policy of Spain in Florida during the second Spanish occupation, will be presented both in the original and in a page for page English translation. The Society has recently sent to Paris for publication the English manuscript of a volume on French Florida which was written by Charles de la Roncièr, conservateur of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. With this will be printed facsimiles in color of the plates of Jacques le Moine de Morgues who accompanied the expedition under René de Laudonnière to Florida, in 1564.

These plates were first printed in black and white by the great printer and engraver, Theodore de Bry, at Frankfort in 1591, both Latin and German editions appearing that year, and other editions several times later. Only three copies of the colored plates are known—one in the William L. Clements Library, one in the New York Public Library, and the third in Paris where the original paintings also are located. Dr. Robertson is completing work on Volume II of the *Colonial Records of Spanish Florida.* This book was left nearly completed by Mrs. Jeannette T. Connor at the time of her death, and will appear under her name. Dr. Robertson is also editing a series of volumes comprising the legislative journals and acts of British West Florida, together with other documents concerned with that province. Some of these records were discovered in the General Land Office at Washington by Dr. Leo F. Stock, working for the Carnegie Institution, and largely through his efforts were transferred to the Library of Congress; others have been photostated for the latter library from the originals in the Public Record Office, London. This work will be published for the Society in 1930 or 1931, through the medium of the Yale University Press.

Professor A. Curtis Wilgus of the University of South Carolina, has completed his manuscript of a History of Hispanic America, for use as a textbook in high schools and colleges.

Historical articles in current periodicals—*General and Miscellaneous:* Vatican Latin Manuscripts in the History of Science and Medicine (Lynn Thorndike, *Isis,* September); Catholicism and the Mystery-Cults (Basil Butler, *Dublin Review,* October); Medieval Monasticism (Egerton Beck, *ibid.*); Rome aux Écoutes de l'Hindoustan: la visite de Msgr. Lépicier (Georges Goyau, *Correspondant,* October 25); Church History by Non-Catholic Historians, IV, V [Guizot, Bryce] (J. E. Graham, *Truth,* October, November); De Collaboratoribus Franciscanis in Bibliis Arabicis a 1671 editis (Arderinus Kleinhans, O. F. M., *Antonianum,* October); De Tempore Compositionis Epistolae Apostolorum, *concluded* (Jacobus Delazer, *ibid.*); The Council of Trent and Tradition (Robert Hull, S. J., *Ecclesiastical Review,* November, December); Communion in the Early Church (J. C. Husslein, S. J., *ibid.*); Estat i Progrés de les Missions de l'Orde Caputxí (P. Calixte de Geispolsheim, O. M. Cap., *Estudis Franciscans,* July-September); Pagan Thought and the Early Church (John Murray,

S. J., *Thought,* December); The Way the Armenians Worship (Donald Attwater, *ibid.*); The Reformation and Reunion (G. G. Coulton, *Churchman,* October); Albertus Magnus (James J. Walsh, *Homiletic Review,* November); St. Francis of Assisi (Alice M. Cooke, *Church Quarterly Review,* October); America and Medieval Europe [the Norse settlement] (Lewis Spence, *Open Court,* September); The Popes and the Jews (W. F. P. Stockley, *Truth,* October).

European: Glimpses of the Religious Struggle in the Tyrol (A. Raybould, *Irish Monthly,* November); Kaiser Otto III und Rom (K. Hampe, *Historische Zeitschrift,* 140, 3); Medieval German Art: a Beginner's Notes (E. F. Jacob, *History,* October); La Universidad de Lovania (Arturo García, *Religion y Cultura,* November); Gerson et l'Education de deux Dauphins de France (Antoine Thomas, *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement,* September-October); Jacques Maritain, Revivalist (G. M. Shuster, *Bookman,* September); *Le Correspondant,* 1829-1929: a Reflex of French Catholic Life (Alphonse Lugan, *Catholic World,* November); A Centenary of Lamarck (R. A. Muttkowski, *Thought,* December); Henry J. Spaunhorst, a Catholic Leader (J. J. Wahlen, *Central-Blatt and Social Justice,* November); The Relations between Rome and Russia, *continued* (Bishop E. C. O'Rourke, *ibid.*); Den russiske Kirke og Sovjetregeringen (A. S. Petersen, *Tilskueren,* November); Vincenzo Gioberti: l'un des maîtres du Risorgimento (L. Cacciapuoti, *Revue de Philosophie,* September-October); Cardinal Gasparri (Arthur Train, *World Today,* November); Atheism and Religion in Russia (Ariadne Williams, *Nineteenth Century,* September).

British Empire: Some Aspects of the English Reformation, 1550-1660 (Edgar Vincent, *Church Quarterly Review,* October); Catholic Emancipation in England (Henry Harrington, *Thought,* December); Emancipation and the Emancipators, *continued* (Donald Attwater, *Irish Monthly,* November); Church Union in Scotland (G. D. Henderson, *Queen's Quarterly,* Autumn); Brother André (J. A. Roy, *ibid.*); Marie de l'Incarnation (Arthur Robert, *Canada Français,* November).

United States: The Columbus Codex in Washington (G. A. Ourand, *America,* October 12); Aboriginal Maryland, 1608-1689, II (Raphael Semmes, *Maryland Historical Magazine,* September); The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition of 1673: a Reply (F. B. Steck, O. F.

M., *Fortnightly Review,* November); Pulaski, Catholic and Patriot (George Barton, *America,* October 19); The Historical Antecedents of St. Francis Seminary, Wisconsin (P. L. Johnson, *Salesianum,* October); How the Baltimore Catechism Originated (J. K. Sharp, *Ecclesiastical Review,* December); The Oblate Sisters of Providence (Grace H. Sherwood, *America,* November 30); Religion in the Western Reserve, 1800-1825 (H. E. Davis, *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly,* July); The Foreign Mission School at Cornwall, Connecticut (Carolyn T. Foreman, *Chronicles of Oklahoma,* September); Father Ryan of the South (H. W. Lovett, *Commonweal,* September 18).

CONTRIBUTORS OF ARTICLES AND MISCELLANY

Rev. GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN, S. J., is Research Professor of History in the Graduate School of St. Louis University (St. Louis, Mo.), editor of *Mid-America* (formerly the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*), and author of several important volumes on American Catholic history, chief of which is his *Catholic Church in Chicago (1673-1871)*, Chicago, 1921.

Rev. MYLES V. RONAN is a curate in the parish church of Dun Laoghaire (Kingston), Ireland, a member of the Royal Irish Academy, author of *The Reformation in Dublin, 1536-1558* (Dublin, 1926), and editor of the official *Catholic Emancipation Record* (Dublin, 1929).

Rev. GERALD G. WALSH, S. J., Ph. D. (Munich), Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Woodstock College, Marquis of Lothian prize-man and sometime Evans Historical Scholar of the University of Oxford, is the author of *Charles IV. A Study in Holy Roman Imperialism.*

Rev. GEORGE LACOMBE, Ph. D., of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, recently appointed Research Professor of Medieval History in the Catholic University of America, with residence in Paris, is at work upon the organization and publication of the *Incipits* of medieval manuscripts.